DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 437 573 CE 079 664

AUTHOR	Melchior, Alan
TITLE	National Evaluation of Serve-America (Subtitle B1). Final Report. Evaluation of National and Community Service Programs.
INSTITUTION	Abt Associates, Inc., Cambridge, MA.; Brandeis Univ., Waltham, MA. Center for Human Resources.
SPONS AGENCY	Corporation for National Service.
PUB DATE	1995-12-21
NOTE	235p.; Prepared with the assistance of: Larry Orr, John Blomquist, Valerie Leiter, Judith Berg, Terry Grobe, and Jennifer Nahas.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Citizenship Education; Cost Effectiveness; Elementary Secondary Education; National Programs; National Surveys; Outcomes of Education; Participant Characteristics; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Public Service; Questionnaires; School Community Relationship; *Service Learning; *Student Participation; Student Volunteers; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Community Service; Impact Studies; *Serve America

ABSTRACT

Serve-America is a national program that was established under the 1990 National and Community Service Act to involve young people in community service and thereby build their understanding of their communities, sense of social responsibility, and commitment to community involvement. In 1992, a 3-year evaluation of Serve-America was initiated to determine its effects on participants, benefits, and cost-effectiveness. The evaluation included observations, document reviews, and participant and control group surveys at 13 local Serve-America program sites. The evaluation established that, as of 1993-94, approximately 434,000 school-aged youths and 90,000 nonparticipant volunteers were participating in Serve-America programs. Serve-America was having positive effects on middle school and high school students and had created new service opportunities in 12 of the 13 intensive study sites. The Serve-America sites studied were producing approximately $3 in direct community benefits for every $1 in program costs. (Thirty tables/figures are included. Appendixes constituting approximately 50% of this document contain the following items: overview of the national evaluation; research and policy background of Serve-America; analysis sample and impact estimation method; definitions of scales and other outcome measures; baseline characteristics of participant and comparison group sample members; Subtitle B1 subgroup analysis; and baseline and follow-up surveys.) (MN)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

CE

ED 437 573

Evaluation of National and Community Service Programs

Final Report: National Evaluation of Serve-America (Subtitle B1)

December 21, 1995

Abt Associates Inc.

55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts
02138-1168

617 492-7100 *telephone*
617 492-5219 *facsimile*

Hampden Square, Suite 500
4800 Montgomery Lane
Bethesda, Maryland
20814-5341

301 913-0500 *telephone*
301 652-3618 *facsimile*

101 North Wacker Drive
Suite 400
Chicago, Illinois
60606-7301

312 332-3300 *telephone*
312 621-3840 *facsimile*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Prepared for
Corporation for National Service
1201 New York Avenue, NW
9th Floor
Washington, DC 20525

Authors:
Alan Melchior
Brandeis University
and
Larry Orr
Abt Associates Inc.

with the assistance of:
John Blomquist
Valerie Leiter
Judith Berg
Terry Grobe
Jennifer Nahas

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE029664

Table of Contents

Chapter One:	Introduction	1
1.1	Background and Purpose of this Report	1
1.2	Major Findings	4
1.3	Organization of this Report	6
Chapter Two:	Serve-America: The National Context	7
2.1	Numbers of Participants and Service Hours: The Scale of Serve-America	9
2.2	Participant Characteristics	10
2.3	Program Characteristics	12
2.4	The Service Experience: Hours and Types of Service	14
2.5	Program Costs	16
2.6	Summary	17
Chapter Three:	The Intensive Study Sites	19
3.1	Characteristics of the Intensive Study Site Programs	19
3.3	Program Setting	25
3.4	Summary	29
Chapter Four:	Participants and the Service Experience	31
4.1	Participant Characteristics and Reasons for Joining	31
4.2	Reasons for Joining	34
4.3	The Service Experience	34
4.4	The Quality of the Service Experience	37
4.5	Implications for the Evaluation	42
Chapter Five:	Impacts on Participants	45
5.1	Methodology	46
5.2	Impacts on Civic and Social Development	48
5.3	Impacts on Involvement in Community Service	52
5.4	Impacts on Academic Performance	55
5.5	Impacts on Risk Behaviors	64
5.6	Subgroup Analysis	65
5.7	Voices from the Field: Participants, Staff, and Others	69
5.8	Summary	73
Chapter Six:	Impacts on Institutions	75
6.1	Creating Expanded Community Service Opportunities and Permanent Programs	76
6.2	Changing Schools as Institutions	79
6.3	Summary and Conclusions	87

Prepared by Abt Associates Inc. and Brandeis University
Center for Human Resources

Chapter Seven: Impacts on the Community 89
7.1 Community Impacts Methodology 89
7.2 Project Accomplishments 90
7.3 Assessing Service Quality 93
7.4 Indirect Benefits 95
7.5 Value of Program Output 96
7.6 Summary 100

Chapter Eight: Cost-effectiveness of Serve-America 101
8.1 Methodology 101
8.2 Findings 102

Chapter Nine: Summary and Conclusion: Implications for Policy and Research 104
9.1 Summary of Findings
9.2 Issues for Research and Policy Development

Appendix A Overview of the National Evaluation
Appendix B Research and Policy Background of Service-America
Appendix C Analysis Sample and Impact Estimation Method
Appendix D Definitions of Scales and Other Outcome Measures
Appendix E Baseline Characteristics of Participant and Comparison Group Sample Members
Appendix F Subtitle B1 Subgroup Analysis
Appendix G Baseline and Followup Surveys

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 2.1	Participation and Hours of Service: Participants and Non-Participant Volunteers	9
Exhibit 2.2	Participant Characteristics	11
Exhibit 2.3	Project Characteristics	13
Exhibit 2.4	Participants Hours, By Type of Service	14
Exhibit 2.5	Programs and Participants By Hours of Service Per Participant	15
Exhibit 2.6	Funding by Source	16
Exhibit 3.1	Summary of Intensive Study Site Characteristics	20
Exhibit 3.2	Selected Program Goals	26
Exhibit 4.1	Participant Characteristics, National and Intensive Study Sites	32
Exhibit 4.2	Participant Characteristics, (Intensive Study Sites)	33
Exhibit 4.3	What Participants Said About Why They Joined	35
Exhibit 4.4	Participation and Hours of Service by Service Area	37
Exhibit 4.5	Service Program Experience	39
Exhibit 4.6	Characteristics of Service Experience	41
Exhibit 5.1	Civic and Social Development	50
Exhibit 5.2	Current Involvement in Community Service	53
Exhibit 5.3	Planned Future Involvement in Community Service	56
Exhibit 5.4	Education-Related Impacts	59
Exhibit 5.5	Education Aspirations	60
Exhibit 5.6	Education Expectations	61
Exhibit 5.7	Hours Spent Doing Homework	62
Exhibit 5.8	Alcohol and Drug Use	65
Exhibit 5.9	Outcomes Examined in Subgroup Analysis	66
Exhibit 5.10	Program Quality: Variation in Impact on Selected Outcomes Between Programs Based on Service Experience Measures	68
Exhibit 6.1	Building-Level Impacts	81
Exhibit 6.2	Impacts on School/Community Relationships	86
Exhibit 7.1	Sponsor's Assessment of the Intensive Study Site Programs' Impacts on Service Projects Performed	92
Exhibit 7.2	Host Agency Assessments of Work Quality, by Service Area, Intensive Sites	94
Exhibit 7.3	Value of Program Output Per Service Hour, Intensive Study Sites	99
Exhibit 8.1	Annual Program Benefits and Costs per Participant	103

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

In 1990, the National and Community Service Act (P.L. 101-610) established the Serve-America program to support school and community-based efforts to involve school-aged youth in community service. The program was funded through grants to states, and through the states to individual schools and school districts. The primary purpose of the program was the development of school-based service-learning strategies that incorporate community service into daily school activities—through the integration of service into academic classes and the establishment of service-learning courses and after-school service activities. Serve-America also provided support for community-based efforts to establish service programs and for efforts to build adult volunteer programs and institutional partnerships with schools.

The primary goal of Serve-America was to involve young people in community service as a means of building their understanding of their communities, their sense of social responsibility, and their commitment to community involvement—to help build an "ethic of civic responsibility" among young people.[1] Serve-America, and community service/service learning generally, were also seen by supporters of the national legislation as having the potential to strengthen a wide variety of attitudes and skills for young people—building a sense of self-esteem and self-confidence, improving critical thinking and academic skills, reducing alienation and risk behaviors—while providing needed services in the community. Finally, for many supporters of the National and Community Service Act of 1990, Serve-America and its emphasis on service-learning was viewed as one element in a broader movement towards education

1. See the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-610, Subtitle B1) for the basic outlines of the Serve-America program. The goals and background of Serve-America are also discussed at length in the first Report of the Commission on National and Community Service, *What You Can Do For Your Country*, Chapters One and Three. There are several other useful introductions to service learning and community service. See, for example, Jane C. Kendall and Associates, *Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service* (Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, 1990); *Visions of Service; The Future of the National and Community Service Act* (Washington, D.C.: National Women's Law Center and the American Youth Policy Forum, 1993); and the June 1991, issue of *Phi Delta Kappan*, which is devoted to articles on Youth Service.

reform, by providing models for more hands-on learning and improved links between communities and schools.[2]

The Purpose of this Report

In 1992, the Commission on National and Community Service (now the Corporation for National Service) contracted with Abt Associates and the Center for Human Resources at Brandeis University to evaluate Serve-America as part of a comprehensive, three year evaluation of all the 1990 National and Community Service Act programs. This report focuses on the scope and impact of the Serve-America Program with particular attention to five basic evaluation questions:

1. ***What was the scope of the program?*** How many students participated and what were their characteristics? How many hours of service did they provide? Would these services have been provided in the absence of the program?

2. ***What was the impact of Serve-America programs on program participants?*** Did service have a positive impact on young people in terms of increased civic responsibility and involvement in service? Increased academic performance? Improved personal and social development?

3. ***What were the institutional impacts of Serve-America on the schools and community-based agencies that took part in the program?*** In particular, did

---

2. It is important to distinguish at the outset two sets of terms: community service and service learning. *Community service* encompasses a broad range of organized service activities in which young people provide volunteer services to meet community needs. *Service learning* is a much narrower term, focusing on organized service that is tied to a structured learning process, including a structured process for reflection. As defined in the 1990 legislation, service learning has four major elements:

   1. Students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service experiences that meet actual community needs and that are coordinated in collaboration with school and community;
   2. Service is integrated into the students' academic curricula or provides structured time for a student to think, talk, or write about what the student did and saw during the actual service activity;
   3. Students have opportunities to use newly acquired skills and knowledge in real-life situations in their own communities; and
   4. Service enhances what is taught in school by extending student learning beyond the classroom and into the community and helps to develop a sense of caring for others. (Section 101(21)).

In this report, the terms "community service" and "service" are used as general terms describing the full range of Serve-America activities, including service learning. "Service learning" will be used specifically to refer to the more structured, learning-focused subgroup of service activities.

Serve-America help establish new service opportunities and/or expand the use of service learning in the nation's schools?

4. ***What were the benefits to communities from the Serve-America program?*** What did the Serve-America program accomplish? What other benefits--in terms of new relationships or changes in community attitudes—were evident?

5. ***Was Serve-America cost-effective?*** What was the cost of the program relative to the benefits that could be measured?

The report draws on observations and data from a sample of thirteen local Serve-America programs selected for intensive study.[3] The data from those sites includes participant and comparison group surveys, school record data, program observations, and interviews with program staff, students, school administrators, service site representatives, and others over an 18 month period (June, 1993-December, 1994). The report also draws on aggregate data collected from Serve-America grantees nationally for the 1993-94 program year.[4]

In examining the results of this report, two points are important to keep in mind. First, this evaluation examines Serve-America at a relatively early stage in its growth, and both the program's accomplishments and its shortcomings should be seen from the perspective of a program at the early part of the learning curve. At the time of the evaluation (the 1993-94 program year), Serve-America was only in its second year of operations. At the national level, Commission staff were just beginning to establish program monitoring procedures, develop technical assistance resources, and examine ways of improving practice. At the local level, the programs in our intensive study sample, and most programs locally, were still relatively new and in the process of testing new ideas, refining their strategies, and working out the logistical kinks that often occur when introducing new programs to schools.

The second, related point is that in large part this evaluation focuses on a single brief time period: the 1993-94 program year. While we have collected data on activities both before and after that period, the major sources of data—participant surveys, school records, interviews with local representatives, etc.—are focused on a single year of operations. These data provide

3. The study sites included a mix of school and community-based programs serving middle and high school-aged youth in four states: Colorado, Massachusetts, Ohio, and South Carolina. The sites are described in Chapter 3. The study did not include elementary school programs.

4. See Appendix A for an overview of the evaluation design.

a rich and comprehensive picture of Serve-America at a point in time, but they cannot answer a number of questions about the longer-term impact and development of these programs, particularly in terms of the institutionalization of service within schools over time or the longer-term impact of service on academic performance or future involvement in service by program participants. These questions, which are critical to a full understanding of the impact of service learning, can only be examined through a longer-term research study.[5]

1.2 Major Findings

Given the early point in its development, the Serve-America program has demonstrated a significant number of impacts on program participants, institutions, and the communities in which it operated. The program has been widely implemented and is affecting large numbers of youth across the country. Based on the results in the intensive study sites, Serve-America has had a positive impact on those youth in terms of civic and social attitudes, involvement in service, and several school-related behaviors. The Serve-America program has resulted in the establishment of new service opportunities in the intensive study site communities, and, though it is too early to determine the degree to which programs are permanent, early indications are that efforts will be made to support the programs locally after the national funding has ended. Finally, Serve-America programs have also resulted in both direct and indirect benefits to their communities through the provision of needed services. The estimated value of those community benefits on a per-participant basis is substantially greater than per-participant program costs. Major findings of this study include:

Scope of the Program

- ***Serve-America has been widely implemented and is affecting large numbers of youth across the country.*** Approximately 434,000 school-aged youth and 90,000 nonparticipant volunteers participated in Serve-America programs during the 1993-94 program year. Participants provided approximately 4.7 million hours of direct service; nonparticipant volunteers contributed another 1.2 million hours of service.

5. A second set of evaluations, beginning ir 1994 under the new legislation, does include some provisions for longer-term, post-program followup.

- ***Serve-America participants represent a diverse group of young people.*** Participants ranged in grade from kindergarten through high school. They were relatively evenly split between males and females (48 percent and 52 percent) and were racially and ethnically diverse: 65 percent of the participants were white and 28 percent were African-American or Hispanic. Twenty-one percent were economically disadvantaged.

Impact on Students Who Participated

- ***Serve-America has had a positive impact on participants in terms of civic and social attitudes, involvement in service, and school-related behaviors.*** Among the high school programs, the evaluation found significant positive impacts on seven outcomes:

  - school attendance
  - personal and social responsibility
  - involvement in volunteer service
  - hours of volunteer service
  - likelihood of future service
  - communications skills, and
  - work orientation

  Among the middle school programs, the evaluation found significant positive impacts on three measures:

  - school attendance
  - hours of homework
  - hours of volunteer service.

- ***Eighty-five percent of the high school participants and 66 percent of the middle school students indicated that they had learned a skill that would be useful in the future.*** A substantial percentage of the high school students (71 percent) also indicated that they had learned more through their service than through a typical class at school.

- ***Ninety-six percent of the high school participants and over 75 percent of the middle school youth indicated that they believed the services they performed were helpful to the community and the individuals served.***

Impact on the Institutionalization of Service

- ***In accordance with the basic goals of the Act, new service opportunities were created in 12 of the 13 intensive study sites.*** These programs appear likely to survive after the Serve-America funding ends, at least in the short term. Given the relatively small size of the initial grants and the short gestation period for these programs, this is a significant accomplishment.

Quality of Services Provided

- ***Serve-America programs provided services that were highly valued by the community.*** The quality of the work performed and the program overall were rated highly by the host agencies where work was performed: on average, the quality of the work was rated as 9.7 out of 10. Similarly, 96 percent of the host agencies rated overall program quality as "good" or "excellent" and 94 percent said they would sponsor participants again.

- ***Participants were performing services that would not have been available otherwise.*** In 68 percent of the projects, none or only some of the work would have been performed without the participants.

Cost-Effectiveness of Service

- ***Serve-America programs represent an extremely cost-effective investment of public funds.*** On average, programs in the intensive study sites produced about $3 in direct community benefits for every dollar in program costs. This figure does not include the value of participant impacts and indirect benefits to the community (e.g. new partnerships, changes in community attitudes, support for youth, etc.).

1.3 Organization of this Report

The remainder of this report is organized into eight chapters:

- Chapter Two provides an overview of Serve-America nationally, based on the national reporting data for program year 1992-94;

- Chapter Three provides a description of the intensive study sites;

- Chapter Four discusses the characteristics of intensive study site participants and their service experiences;

- Chapter Five focuses on the impacts on participants in the study sites, based on the participant surveys, school records, and on-site interviews;

- Chapter Six assesses the institutional impacts in the study sites;

- Chapter Seven discusses impacts on the community and project accomplishments;

- Chapter Eight provides information on the cost-effectiveness of the community service programs in the intensive study sites; and

- Chapter Nine summarizes the major findings and their implications for policy and research.

CHAPTER TWO

SERVE-AMERICA: THE NATIONAL CONTEXT

The Serve-America program was established as a decentralized system of locally designed and operated school and community-based programs. Under the 1990 legislation, Serve-America grants were awarded to states which, in turn, were required to subgrant those funds to local schools and community-based organizations, generally through a competitive proposal process.[1] Funding was allocated among the states based on a formula driven by the state's school-aged population and the federal Chapter 1 school funding allocation. In order to qualify for the grant, each state was required to submit a plan outlining the proposed use of the funds.

Within states, Serve-America funds could be used to support several types of programs. At least 60 percent of the Serve-America funds had to be committed to school-based service-learning programs; an additional 15 percent or more had to be used to fund community-based organizations (though in many cases, those organizations then worked with in-school youth); and up to 10 percent could be awarded to partnerships and adult volunteer programs.[2]

In 1992, the Commission awarded $16.2 million in grants to 57 grantees (47 of which were states) which, in turn, awarded an estimated 1,000 subgrants to local schools, school districts, and community organizations. In 1993, the Commission awarded $16.1 million in grants, funding approximately 1,460 local subgrantees and an estimated 2,100 local programs.[3]

---

1. Funds were also awarded to a number of other governmental bodies, including U.S. territories and Indian tribes. In those instances where a state decided not to apply for funds, one or more local agencies within that state could apply directly to the Commission for a grant.

2. States could also fund a variety of planning and capacity-building efforts, including pre-service and in-service training for teachers; development of service-learning curricula; encouragement of local partnership efforts; research and evaluation; outreach to nonprofit community-based organizations; and integration of service-learning into academic curricula.

3. In 1993, the National and Community Service Act was amended by the National and Community Service Trust Act. That legislation established a new national service program (AmeriCorps) that effectively replaced the Conservation and Youth Service Corps and the National Model provisions of the original Act, modified the Serve-America program (and renamed it Learn and Serve K-12), and created a new federal agency, the ***Corporation for National Service*** (CNS), that combined the Commission with the ACTION program and the White House Office of National Service. Under that new legislation, federal funding for national and community service expanded significantly, to over $300 million in grants in 1994, with approximately $30 million in funding for programs under Learn and Serve K-12.

The network of programs that grew out of this system was highly diverse and locally focused. The process established by the legislation of subgranting funds within each state meant that program design and operation took place largely at the local level, where individual classrooms, schools, school districts, and community-based organizations established new programs and/or expanded existing community service efforts. Programs ranged from elementary to high school-level initiatives and varied widely in terms of program type, scope, and structure; in terms of the characteristics and numbers of participants; and in terms of the service experience offered to participating youth. This diversity is perhaps the most notable characteristic of the Serve-America program as a whole. While all Serve-America programs share some common goals, there is no such thing as a "typical" Serve-America program. Recognizing that, one of the goals of this evaluation has been to identify broad categories that can be used in program analysis without obscuring the high degree of diversity among local efforts.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the Serve-America program nationally and to establish the broader context for the analysis of program impacts in the thirteen study sites. The material in this chapter is based on data provided by subgrantees to the Commission's national reporting system for the 1993-94 program year, covering the period from July 1, 1993 through June 30, 1994. Approximately 1,100 subgrantees (75 percent) provided descriptive information on their projects and 1065 subgrantees (73 percent) provided information on participant characteristics and hours of service.[4]

---

4. Most of the data that follows draws on two sets of reports made by subgrantees to the Commission. The Project Description Form, which was completed at the beginning of the program year, provides information on the characteristics of individual B1 programs, such as funding source, format, administering organizations, and types of service activities. The Participation and Service Report, which was completed at mid-year and the end of the program year, provides aggregate program-level information on the numbers of participants, their demographic characteristics, and service hours. A third form, the Subgrantee Summary, which was also completed at the beginning of the program cycle, provides information at the subgrantee level (which may encompass several programs) on funding, planned numbers of participants, and administering organization. Of the 1,463 subgrantees, 1,103 (75 percent) returned Project Description forms; 1,065 (73 percent) returned Participation and Service Reports, and 1,182 (81 percent) returned Subgrantee Summary forms. In many instances, subgrantees supported more than one service project. Consequently, the number of "projects" is higher than the total numbers of subgrantees. All of the figures discussed in this chapter have been adjusted to take into account nonresponding subgrantees.

Data on the first year of Serve-America programs (PY 1992-93) were presented in an earlier report, *Serving America: The First Year of Programs Funded by the Commission on National and Community Service* (March 1994).

The pages that follow provide information on five major elements of the Serve-America program: numbers of participants and service hours, participant characteristics, program characteristics, hours and types of service, and program costs.

2.1 Numbers of Participants and Service Hours: The Scale of Serve-America

During the 1993-94 program year, Serve-America programs reached an estimated 435,000 school-aged youth, who participated in approximately 2,100 local Serve-America programs (see Exhibit 2.1). An additional 90,000 individuals also took part in Serve-America community service activities as "non-participant volunteers"—individuals participating in adult volunteer programs (as mentors, for example) who assisted in the operation of youth-serving programs, or individuals who participated in one-time volunteer events (such as a one-day community clean-up). Serve-America participants provided approximately 4.7 million hours of volunteer service, with an additional 1.1 million hours contributed by non-participant volunteers. School-aged participants also took part in an additional 2.8 million hours of service-related activities—primarily classroom hours associated with their service-learning activities.

Exhibit 2.1
Participation and Hours of Service:
Participants and Non-participant Volunteers
(1993-94 Program Year)

Total participants	434,861
Total non-participant volunteers	90,383
Participant hours	
· Service hours	4,659,904
· Service-related activities	2,814,172
· Unspecified	532,281
· Total	8,006,357
Non-participant volunteer hours	1,182,819
Total hours	9,189,176

Source: Participation and Service Reports adjusted for nonresponse (1,065 of 1,463 subgrantees reporting).

2.2 PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

Serve-America's primary focus is on the integration of community service into the educational process for school-aged youth, and the data on the characteristics of participants in the 1993-94 programs reflect this focus. (See Exhibit 2.2.) Ninety-five percent of the young people in Serve-America were in-school youth, despite the fact that 23 percent of the programs were community-based.[5]

In terms of age, race and ethnicity, and economic status, the participant in Serve-America programs represented a diverse group of young Americans. Participants ranged in age from 5 (kindergarten) through the late teens: 22 percent were elementary school-aged, 39 percent were in middle school, and the other 39 percent are high school aged and older. Participants were relatively evenly split between males and females (48 percent and 52 percent). On a national basis, Serve-America was also ethnically and racially diverse: 65 percent of the participants were white and 28 percent were African-American and Hispanic. These figures roughly parallel the national figures for the school-aged population.[6] Twenty-one percent of the participants were economically disadvantaged—again, a figure that reflects the overall distribution of low-income youth in the population.[7]

It is important to note, however, that while the overall Serve-America program was racially and ethnically diverse ***across*** programs, the degree of racial and ethnic diversity ***within*** individual Serve-America programs were more limited. Sixty percent of the Serve-America programs reporting drew 75 percent or more of their participants from a single racial/ethnic group; only 19 percent of the programs had substantial representation (25 percent or more of participants) from two or more racial or ethnic groups. These figures suggest that, while Serve-

---

5. One of the continuing concerns with the Serve-America program at the national level has been the relatively low percentage (less than 5 percent) of out-of-school youth who are participating in the program. One of the responses in the 1993 revisions to the legislation was the establishment of a separate funding stream for community-based initiatives for school-aged youth with the expectation that this funding would help to increase community-focused (as opposed to school-focused) efforts.

6. Figures for racial and ethnic distributions in elementary and secondary schools for 1990 are as follows: 71 percent of the school-aged population was white; 15 percent were Black; 11 percent Hispanic; 3 percent Asian/Pacific; and 1 percent Alaskan/American Indian. Figures are drawn from the U.S. Department of Education, *Condition of Education* (Washington, 1994), Supplementary Table 37-1.

7. Economically disadvantaged was defined as being eligible for free lunch programs, JTPA, Summer Youth Employment Programs, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Food Stamps, or other income tested welfare programs. The 1990 Census reports that 17.9 percent of Americans below the age of 18 live at or below the poverty level.

Exhibit 2.2
PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS
(1993-94 Program Year)

Participant Characteristics	Percent of Participants
Age:	
5-10	22%
11-14	39
15-17	31
18 or older	8
Gender:	
Male	48%
Female	52
Race/ethnicity:	
White (non-Hispanic)	65%
Black (non-Hispanic)	18
Hispanic/Latino	10
Asian	4
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1
Other	2
School Status:	
In school	95%
High school dropout/out of school	2
High school graduate/out of school	3
Teen parent	1%
Economically disadvantaged	21%

Source: Participation and Service Reports adjusted for nonresponse (1,065 of 1,463 subgrantees reporting.

Sample size: 317,417 participants.

America is serving major population groups in equitable proportion to their presence in the community, students in those programs are more likely to experience diversity from their contacts with those being served than from working alongside others with a different racial or ethnic background.

2.3 PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Serve-America programs encompassed a diverse array of program models (see Exhibit 2.3). Approximately 70 percent of the programs were school-based initiatives; another 23 percent were operated by community-based agencies. The balance were programs involving adults as volunteers or fostering school/community partnerships.

Within this mix, three major program strategies were evident. Forty percent of the programs were service-learning initiatives that integrated service into a regular academic course (such as English or math). Another 13 percent were freestanding service-learning courses that combined service with research, discussion, and writing about community issues. Forty-one percent were simple volunteer service programs without a formal, structured curriculum. Six percent reported a mix of strategies.[8]

Programs also varied in the scope of the local effort (some were school or district-wide, others focused on a single classroom), the age and grade level targeted (elementary, middle, or high school), and in the program setting (urban, suburban, rural). This diversity is one of the most notable characteristics of the Serve-America program and reflects the program's emphasis on local program design.

Finally, individual Serve-America programs also differed widely in terms of the size of the program. The nature of the national reporting makes it difficult to characterize average program size, since some communities reported their activities for the subgrant as a whole and others reported separately for each different program or set of activities. On average, Serve-America "programs" (however locally defined) had approximately 260 participants, though figures ranged from a low of 1 participant to a high of 30,000 for a large, district-level effort.

---

8. When project format is broken down by project type, it is clear that *service-learning* programs that link service to an academic curriculum were more likely to be found among school-based initiatives, while *service-only* programs were more common among community-based efforts. Sixty-five percent of the school-based projects were curriculum-based (service courses or service integrated into an academic course), and 30 percent were service-only (the balance are service corps or combinations), while 67 percent of the community-based programs were service-only projects and 26 percent were curriculum-based.

Exhibit 2.3
PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS
(1993-94 Program Year)

	Percent of Projects	Percent of Participant Hours
Project Type:		
School-Based	68%	70%
Community-Based	23	15
Adult Volunteer/Partnership	7	12
Combination	2	3
Project Format:		
Service learning in an academic curriculum	40%	50
Service learning course	13	16
Volunteer service (not classroom-based)	41	32
Service corps	1	2
Combination	5	0
Project Scope:		
District-wide	19%	36%
School-wide	28	29
Grade-wide	7	6
One or more classrooms	16	9
Out-of-school youth	1	5
Specific geographic area	12	8
Other	12	7
Combination	4	0
Grade Levels (Administering Organizations):[a]		
Elementary School	12%	19%
Middle School	16	10
High School	33	26
School District	34	42
Consortium of School Districts	5	3
Location:		
Urban	41%	47%
Rural	34	29
Suburban	25	24

Source: Project Description Forms and Participation and Service Reports, for projects active between July 1, 1994, and August 31, 1994, adjusted for nonresponse (1,103 of 1,463 subgrantees reporting).

[a] Figures reflect distribution among administering organizations that are educational institutions. Data do not include community-based organizations, local governments, or other administering organizations.

The majority of programs, however, were relatively small. Half of the programs reporting had fewer than 54 participants; 60 percent had under 100.

2.4 THE SERVICE EXPERIENCE: HOURS AND TYPES OF SERVICE

While the overall scope of Serve-America is substantial, the hours of service provided by each participant were often limited, highlighting the program's character as a part-time program integrated into an already busy school day, rather than a full-time service experience. On average, Serve-America participants provided 11 hours of direct service and approximately 18 hours of total program participation over the course of the school year. The majority of the direct service hours (63 percent) fell within two broad categories: education-related service (mentoring, tutoring, classroom assistants, etc.), and human service-related activities (including work in hospitals, nursing homes, and social service agencies), with community improvement and environmental activities comprising most of the balance (see Exhibit 2.4). Almost all of the balance of the participant hours (89 percent) were spent in classroom-related activities. On average, participants spent slightly less than 60 percent of their program time involved in direct service in the community.

Exhibit 2.4
PARTICIPANT HOURS, BY TYPE OF SERVICE
(1993-94 Program Year)

	Number of Hours	Percent of Total Hours
Service hours:		
Education	1,575,078	34%
Human Service	1,352,323	29
Community improvement	738,919	16
Environment	562,191	12
Public safety	155,639	3
Other service	275,755	6
Total service hours	4,659,904	100
Service-related activities:		
Classroom hours	2,508,258	89%
Other hours	305,914	11
Total service-related activities	2,814,172	100
Activity not specified	532,281	7%

Source: Participation and Service Reports adjusted for nonresponse (1,065 of 1,463 subgrantees reporting).

It is not clear to what extent the limited average hours of service reflect a weakness in this early generation of Serve-America programs. As Exhibit 2.5 shows, nearly half of the Serve-America programs, serving over 70 percent of the participants, averaged fewer than 10 hours of direct service per participant. To the extent that the impact of service-learning is directly related to the intensity of the service experience, programs that provide a relatively low intensity experience are likely to have only a limited impact. As such, the average hours of service among Serve-America programs is an indicator that bears watching.[9]

Exhibit 2.5
PROGRAMS AND PARTICIPANTS BY HOURS OF SERVICE PER PARTICIPANT
(1993-94 Program Year)

Hours Per Participant	% of Programs	% of Participants
Less than 10 Hours	49%	73%
10 to 20 Hours	18%	12%
21 to 50 Hours	20%	11%
51 to 100 Hours	8%	3%
100 or More Hours	5%	1%

Source: Participation and Service Reports adjusted for nonresponse (1,065 of 1,463 subgrantees reporting).

However, it is important to recognize two points. The first is that Serve-America, in contrast to the Youth Service Corps and National Demonstration programs funded under the 1990 Act, is intended to be a part-time program involving a limited number of hours per week,

9. It is important to note that, while service hours and participant impact are related, the relationship is not simple and direct. Conrad and Hedin, for example, found that impact was best explained by a combination of program intensity (hours per week), duration, and the presence of time for organized reflection. They concluded that "intensity may be a necessary but not sufficient condition for program effectiveness." See Dan Conrad and Diane Hedin, *Experiential Education Evaluation Project*, (Minneapolis: Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota, 1981), 147. As discussed in Chapter 5 of this report, the Serve-America evaluation did not find a significant relationship between hours of service and program impacts, but did find a relationship between the characteristics of the service experience (whether it was challenging, involved independent decision-making, included reflection, etc.) and program impacts on participants.

generally to be fitted into an already busy school day. In that regard, the low-intensity nature of Serve-America needs to be recognized from the beginning and be taken into account in assessing both the program's activities and potential impacts.

The second, related point is that the majority of Serve-America participants are elementary and middle school-aged students. For those students in particular, much of service-learning is designed to provide an initial introduction to service and is one of an ongoing series of classroom or school projects and activities. One of the major observations from the intensive study sites was the sharp distinction between middle and high school programs in terms of the hours of service for each participant. While high school students in the study sites often provided 60 to 80 hours of service in a semester, the figures for the middle school participants were between 20 and 30 hours. In short, the relatively small average for hours of service may reflect as much the lower intensity of service-learning programs for younger participants as shortcomings in the first generation of Serve-America programs.

2.5 Program Costs

The total funding for Serve-America for the 1993-94 program year was $16.9 million, which included $1 million in grants to "leader states" for technical assistance activities. As shown in Exhibit 2.6, every CNCS dollar was matched by $1.20 in non-federal monies.

Exhibit 2.6
Funding by Source[a]
(1993-94 Program Year)

	Planned Funding	Percent of Total Funding	Average Per-Participant Costs
CNCS	$16,251,377	41%	$37
Other federal	$3,239,845	8	$7
Non-federal	$19,598,892	50	$45
Other (non-specified) funding	$184,930	1	$0
Total funding	$39,275,044	100	$90

Source: Subgrantee Summary Forms adjusted for nonresponse (1,181 of 1463 subgrantees reporting).

[a] Planned funding for CNCS Program Year 2.

The most striking aspect of Serve-America's funding, however, is the extremely low per-participant cost for the Serve-America program. When the reported figures are adjusted for nonresponse, they result in a figure of less than $40 i CNCS funding per participant, and approximately $90 per participant in total CNCS and matching funds.

2.6 SUMMARY

Taken together, these figures present a picture of a diverse body of local programs that offer an introduction to service for large numbers of school-aged youth at relatively low cost. Serve-America programs cover a broad span of age groups, and a variety of different program types and program designs. As the later analysis will suggest, these different types of programs, particularly those serving younger and older youth, each need to be examined and evaluated on their own terms. While Serve-America as a whole is administered as a single "program," the local experience suggests that it is really a multiplicity of different service experiences.

CHAPTER THREE
THE INTENSIVE STUDY SITES

The major source for the evaluation of the impacts of the Serve-America program is the experience of a sample group of thirteen intensive study sites. Like Serve-America programs nationally, these sites represent a variety of community service and service-learning strategies, including both school and community-based programs, programs serving middle and high school-aged youth, programs that are curriculum-based and those that are volunteer service only, and programs operating in low-income urban neighborhoods, middle-class suburbs, and rural communities.

The purpose of this chapter is to briefly profile the thirteen intensive study sites to establish the context for the impact analysis in the chapters that follow. Chapter Four provides an overview of the participants in the intensive study sites and their service experience.

The information presented here is largely drawn from data gathered directly from the sites through the on-site interviews.

3.1 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INTENSIVE STUDY SITE PROGRAMS

The thirteen Serve-America intensive study sites represent a wide range of locally developed school and community-based programs. As shown in Exhibit 3.1, the programs include a mix of different program characteristics in terms of program type, format, scope, location, grade level, and size. Taken together, they represent a cross-section of programs that corresponds in large part with the distribution of different program types across the country as a whole:

- Eight of the programs were ***school-based initiatives***: Campus, Redlands, and Forest Park Middle Schools, and Centennial, Medway, North Olmsted, Lancaster, and Britten's Neck High School. A ninth program, the Magic Makers program at Toledo's Libbey High School, was also officially school-based, though actually operated by a community-based organization (the Girl Scouts).

Exhibit 3.1
Summary of Intensive Study Site Characteristics

Site	Type	Format	Scope	Number of Participants	Description
Middle School Programs					
Campus Middle School Englewood, CO	School-based	Service integrated into curriculum	Grade-wide	221	Program integrates service project into eighth grade social studies program in suburban middle school.
Redlands Middle School Grand Junction, CO	School-based	Service integrated into curriculum	School-wide	560	School-wide program in new community school incorporates mix of advisory period projects, integrated service learning, and school-wide one-day event.
Southwest Improvement Council Denver, CO	Community-based	Service only	Neighborhood	90	Afterschool program in low-income neighborhood in Denver primarily involving middle-school aged youth in neighborhood cleanup, "graffiti busting," and chores for elderly citizens.
Forest Park/ Springfield Public Schools Springfield, MA	School-based	Service only	District-wide	n/a	Urban middle school with multiple service projects in district with district-wide commitment to community service.
Helpline/Teenline Columbia, SC	Community-based	Service only	Target Population	192	Afterschool program for low-income middle school students designed to provide an initial community service experience.

- continued -

Exhibit 3.1 ***(continued)***
SUMMARY OF INTENSIVE STUDY SITE CHARACTERISTICS

Site	Type	Format	Scope	Number of Participants	Description
High School Programs					
Centennial High School Fort Collins, CO	School-based	Service integrated into curriculum	School-wide	115	Alternative school program incorporating a week of service (landscaping school grounds) every six-week "hexter."
Medway High School Medway, MA	School-based	Service course	Class	27	Community service course combining classroom orientation and reflection with individual service assignments in suburban community.
Fall River 2000 Fall River, MA	Adult/ Partnership	Service only	District-wide	35	Peer leadership and community service program targeted to low-income, urban students and organized by a partnership between the public schools, community agencies, and a public housing authority.
North Olmsted High School North Olmsted, OH	School-based	Service integrated into curriculum	Class	60	Integrated social studies, English, and community service course for high school seniors in suburban Cleveland.
Toledo Magic Makers Toledo, OH	School-based	Service only	School-wide	39	Afterschool program organized by the Girl Scouts in a low-income, urban high school.
Lancaster High School Lancaster, SC	School-based	Service course	Class	38	Afterschool service course integrating classroom orientation and reflection with individual service assignments in small southern city.
Britten's Neck High School Gresham, SC	School-based	Service integrated into curriculum	Class	49	Project to build and landscape a community park integrated into high school agricultural sciences program in a small, rural community.
Lima Adult Mentoring Lima, OH	Adult/ Partnership	Adult mentoring	District-wide	n/a	District-wide mentoring program targeting at-risk students (all grade levels) in small, "rust belt" manufacturing city in Ohio.

Source: Project Description Forms and Participation and Service Reports, Site Visit Information. Springfield data reported on a district-wide basis and was not available for individual schools. As an adult mentoring program, the Lima program did not have any student participants (the volunteers were adults; students were the beneficiaries of the program.) In 1993-94, there were 40 adult mentors.

- Two of the programs were ***community-based efforts***: Southwest Improvement Council and Teenline.[1]

- Two of the programs, Fall River 2000 and the Lima Adult Mentoring program, were funded as ***adult volunteer/partnership*** programs. The Fall River program was a joint effort of the public schools, the public housing authority, and several community groups to involve students in leadership and service activities. The Lima program linked adult volunteers with students at all grade levels in the public schools as part of a district-wide drug abuse and dropout prevention initiative.

Seven of the programs served ***high school-aged*** youth, and five were targeted to ***middle school-aged*** participants.[2]

High School Programs. The seven high school-aged programs included a mix of settings and program strategies, including ***service courses***, ***service integrated into academic curriculum***, and ***extracurricular (service only) programs***:

- Two of the high school programs, ***Medway*** and ***Lancaster***, were freestanding service learning courses. Both programs combined a weekly classroom session with a variety of individual service assignments (and a requirement for a minimum of 90 hours of program activity) over the course of a semester. The Medway Community Service Learning Course took place during the school day (last period of the day) and was run by a certified teacher. The Lancaster program, though an elective in the school curriculum, took place after school. That program was originally led by a teacher from the adult education program, and later by a non-certified instructor from the community.

- Two of the programs, ***North Olmsted*** and ***Britten's Neck***, integrated service into individual academic courses. The North Olmsted, Ohio, SITES program (Student Involvement Through Education and Service) combined English, social studies, and a community service curriculum in a year-long course for high school seniors. The program linked two semester-long individual service assignments (approximately four to five hours per week) with the academic curriculum through a variety of special projects, research papers, and group presentations. The Britten's Neck program integrated community service into the high school's agricultural sciences

1. It is important to note that the distinction between school and community-based programs is largely an administrative one, based on the funding stream for the program. As noted, the "school-based" Magic Makers program, whose funding was administered by the Toledo Public Schools, was actually operated by the Girl Scouts under a contract with the schools. Conversely, the Teenline program in Columbia, South Carolina, was a community-based initiative, but operated as part of the afterschool program on a school site.

2. As noted in Chapter One, the study did not include any programs targeted to elementary school-aged children.

program. The major activity for this program was the construction and maintenance of a community park.

- The ***Centennial High School*** community service program integrated service into the regular program of study at a small alternative high school in Fort Collins, Colorado. Students took part in a campus landscaping project and neighborhood environmental projects as part of a service week that took place at the end of every six-week "hexter" and as part of individual academic courses that used the service projects to reinforce academic skills.

- The ***Toledo Magic Makers*** program and ***Fall River*** partnership project were both afterschool efforts linking schools and local community groups. Magic Makers operated as an afterschool activity for high school-aged girls run by the Girl Scouts. Participants signed up each week to participate in one or more, generally short-term, service activities, primarily aimed at providing these young women with an initial service experience.

  The Fall River IMAGE program was a partnership between the schools and several community agencies designed to involve young, in-school residents of public housing in peer leadership activities. Participants in the program took part in a weekly training session, gave presentations on violence prevention in local schools, and developed a variety of service projects for elderly residents of public housing through the Council on Aging.

Middle School Programs. The five middle school programs represented a mix of in-school and out-of-school programs. Three of the middle school programs were in-school efforts:

- ***Campus Middle School*** in suburban Denver integrated service into the eighth grade social studies curriculum. As part of a semester-long focus on social issues, students in the social studies classes identified and researched community issues, prepared research papers on their topics, and took part in brief service activities related to their issue. Activities ranged from serving meals in a shelter to answering telephones at the office of the area Congressional representative.

- ***Redlands Middle School's*** "Grand Vision" initiative was a school-wide effort developed as part of the school's basic "community school" philosophy. Under the program, service has become one of the themes for the advisory (or activity) periods in which all students participate. Each advisory group develops and conducts at least one service project during the course of the year, with projects ranging from raising funds for a Headstart project to work on a community park. All students also participate in a one-day event, the "Day of Caring," in which students help plan and participate in one of approximately 20 different service activities, including social service, environmental, and community improvement efforts.

- ***Forest Park Middle School*** is part of a district-wide service initiative in Springfield, Massachusetts. A district-level service learning coordinator provides training and technical assistance to teachers interested in service, and helps to coordinate a number of district-wide initiatives linking area firms to local schools around service projects. At Forest Park, individual teachers have integrated service into their academic clusters, as well as into activity period programs.

The other two middle school programs represent community-based, afterschool activities:

- ***The Southwest Improvement Council*** (SWIC) program was a neighborhood-based, afterschool effort that involved low-income, urban middle school-aged youngsters in a variety of neighborhood cleanup and assistance efforts, most notably an ongoing "graffiti-busters" program in which SWIC participants cleaned or painted over graffiti on neighborhood buildings.

- The ***Teenline*** program was an afterschool initiative designed to provide an introduction to community service for urban middle school youth. Operated by a community mental health hotline, the major focus of the program was on service activities (poster-making and the like) that would increase middle school student awareness of available youth hotline services and that would lead program participants to eventual service with the hotline when they reached high school.

3.2 Diversity in Program Goals

As the mix of school levels and program strategies would suggest, the intensive study site programs encompassed a wide range of program goals and expected impacts, though a few common, core goals were shared by all. Virtually all of the programs, for example, pointed to improved self-esteem and self-image as key participant impacts, and most identified the development of a sense of civic responsibility and community awareness among participants as a central goal. Most also identified improved academic performance as an outcome, but programs differed in their emphasis in this area: some saw their goal as improved attendance and dropout prevention, while others hoped to improve basic skills. A few programs highlighted career awareness as a goal, and roughly a third mentioned reduced risk behaviors as a priority.

Similarly, the intensive study site programs differed in their institutional and community goals. While all of the programs saw the Serve-America grant as an opportunity to establish or expand community service opportunities within their institutions, relatively few of the sites

identified a broader set of institutional impacts—in terms of the broader integration of service learning into the curriculum, for example—as a priority. Exhibit 3.2 presents an overview of selected program goals from the intensive study sites, based on Project Description forms and site visit interviews.

The significance of the differences in program goals (as well as in program structure and participant characteristics) again lies in the fact that the programs in Serve-America (and the intensive study sites) do not represent a single, consistently defined model. While most share a common framework emphasizing citizenship, personal growth, and academic achievement, the degree to which any one of those goals, or any element of each goal, is emphasized depends on each program's specific focus and priorities.

3.3 Program Setting

While the intensive study sites vary along a number of dimensions, two sets of program characteristics stood out as particularly critical in distinguishing among the programs within the group of intensive study sites. The first of these is the division between programs serving younger, middle school-aged children and those targeted to older, high school-aged youth. Though there was substantial variation within each group, overall these two sets of programs differed substantially in terms of the organization of the programs, their size, and the intensity of the service experience they offered to participants. The second important distinguishing feature was whether the program operated within or outside regular school hours.

Middle School Programs

In broad terms, the middle school programs were designed to provide an initial service experience for young people as part of a broader developmental mission. For the in-school programs, service was designed as one element in the larger middle school curriculum, and was often described as providing "a taste" of service or an opportunity for exposure to community issues, the idea of service, and/or the use of academic skills in the community. The in-school initiatives at the middle schools also tended to be relatively large-scale efforts, cutting across all the classes in a grade (at Campus) or involving most or all of the school population. At both Redlands and Forest Park, for example, the middle school "activity" or "advisory" periods

Exhibit 3.2
SELECTED PROGRAM GOALS

Site	Increased Self-Esteem/ Self-Image	Career Awareness	Social/Civic Responsi-bility	Increased Community Awareness	Improved Attendance/ Dropout Reduction	Enrich Academic Skills	Improve Grades	Avoid Risk Behaviors
Campus Middle School	X	X	X	X		X		
Redlands Middle School	X		X	X		X	X	X
Southwest Improvement Council		X	X	X	X			X
Forest Park/Springfield Public Schools	X		X	X		X		
Helpline/Teenline	X		X			X		
Centennial High School	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Medway High School	X		X			X		
Fall River 2000	X		X					
North Olmsted High School	X	X	X	X		X		
Toledo Magic Makers	X	X	X		X		X	X
Lancaster High School	X	X	X	X				
Britten's Neck High School			X				X	

Source: EIS Project Description forms and site visit information.

provided a time period in which service-learning activities could be developed for most or all students as part of a core set of activities at the school. Finally, the middle school activities generally took place over a relatively short period of time and as group activities rather than as individual service projects.

For the two community-based programs, while the structure was different (e.g., afterschool programs), the goals were essentially similar: to provide an initial service experience for young people and an introduction to the idea of working for the community.

High School Programs

The programs for high school youth, in contrast, tended to be concentrated in individual classrooms and designed to provide a more focused and intensive service experience. Three of the high school programs (Medway, North Olmsted, and Lancaster) used an individual placement model, with one or two students working several hours each week with a single service site for an extended period of time. At both Centennial and Britten's Neck, service was focused on landscaping projects associated with the school, and service activities were performed as a group. Fall River's program involved a mix of group and small team experiences, with three or four youth working together on a presentation to school students or with elderly housing residents.

With the exception of the service program at Centennial High School, there were no school- or grade-wide efforts at the high school level. Instead, most of the projects tended to be relatively small-scale and perceived as "owned" by one or two teachers. It became clear from comments from the sites and discussions with practitioners that most high schools, with their individual student schedules and their course-based structure, are simply not organized for grade- or school-wide efforts. The school-wide effort at Centennial was notable in large part because it took place in an alternative school setting rather than a traditional high school.

Within the intensive study sites, the differences between the middle and high school programs translated into substantially different kinds of community service and service-learning experiences. The most readily evident difference was in the average hours of direct service, where high school-aged students performed two to five times as many hours of service. But as the discussion of the program experiences will show, the differences translated into the quality of the experience as well.

In-School vs. Out-of-School or Afterschool Programs

The other set of differences that stood out among the intensive study sites were between programs operating within and outside the school day. This is a distinction that cuts across many of the lines of program description, because the "out-of-school" programs include both community and school-based efforts, and a mix of curricular and non-curricular program strategies.

Among the intensive study sites, five programs operated outside the regular school day. Among programs serving middle school youth, the SWIC program and Teenline were both community-based initiatives operating after school, though Teenline actually operated at a number of school sites. Among high school programs, three programs operated after or out-of-school: the Fall River partnership, Toledo's Magic Makers program, and Lancaster's Community Service Learning program. Of the three, the Lancaster program was a curriculum-based service learning course but was scheduled after the end of the school day. The other two programs were community-based efforts operated by local community-based organizations.[3]

The differences between in-school and out-of-school programs were most evident in the relationship between the program and the larger school as an institution. For program staff and school administrators involved in out-of-school programs, the out-of-school approach offered several distinct advantages. They argued that an out-of-school strategy was easier to implement (because it did not require changes in the school schedule) and offered a more relaxed, freer atmosphere for students and teachers to interact as peers. In Lancaster, when participants were offered the option of scheduling the program into the school day, they voted against the change.

At the same time, the out-of-school approach also carried a number of disadvantages. The most notable was the lack of contact and interaction between program staff and the teachers and administrators in the schools. All of the out-of-school programs found it difficult to get other teachers involved in program activities or to get or share information about individual participants. In some instances, this lack of contact translated into regular problems with program operation (where school resources were needed but unavailable). As will be discussed

3. Though operated by the Girl Scouts, Toledo's Magic Makers program was actually funded through a grant to Libbey High School and is counted as a school-based effort in the national reporting.

in the chapter on institutional impacts, however, the major consequence was an additional barrier to the spread of service and service learning to other parts of the school.

3.4 SUMMARY

Taken together, the intensive study sites represent a broad cross-section of program types, strategies, and goals that were largely representative of Serve-America as a whole. Within the broad diversity of those sites, two major sets of characteristics stand out as particularly critical in distinguishing among intensive site programs: grade level (middle vs. high school-aged youth); and place/time of operation (within vs. outside of regular school hours). In the discussion of participant and institutional impacts in Chapters Five and Six, these sets of characteristics help to set the framework for the analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR

PARTICIPANTS AND THE SERVICE EXPERIENCE

The participants in the Serve-America study sites also reflected the diversity of Serve-America nationally. They were a racially, ethnically, and economically diverse, and were also diverse in terms of the social and educational experiences they brought to the programs. Their reasons for joining also varied, ranging from a desire to help others to an interest in exploring careers. The nature of the service experience for students also varied substantially in terms of the type and hours of service they provided, and in terms of the degree to which their service was challenging, involved responsibility and independent decision-making, and provided opportunities for discussion and reflection. Most participants in the study sites, however, viewed their service experience positively and felt that the service they provided was helpful to the community.

4.1 PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS AND REASONS FOR JOINING

The participants in the service programs in the intensive study sites were a diverse group of young people whose demographic characteristics closely paralleled those of Serve-America participant nationally. Almost all the participants were in-school youth—even those served by the community-based programs. Participants were evenly divided among males and females. Sixty-five percent of the participants were white, 21 percent black, and 11 percent were Hispanic. Thirty-two percent of the participants were economically disadvantaged—a somewhat higher proportion than had been found among participants nationwide. Exhibit 4.1 provides a comparison of intensive study site participants and participants nationally.

The descriptive information collected as part of the baseline survey of participants in the study sites provides additional detail on the characteristics of the program participants and reinforces that finding that Serve-America attracted a wide variety of young people. As Exhibit 4.2 shows, on the one hand, participants in the survey were a relatively active and involved group of students. Forty-two percent of the high school students and 32 percent of the middle school students had worked for pay during the previous school year. Seventy-seven percent of the high school students and nearly 90 percent of the middle school youth participated

Exhibit 4.1
PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS,
NATIONAL AND INTENSIVE STUDY SITES

Participant Characteristics	National	Intensive Study Sites
Gender:		
Male	48%	50%
Female	52%	50%
Race/Ethnicity:		
White (non-Hispanic)	65%	65%
Black (non-Hispanic)	18%	21%
Hispanic/Latino	10%	11%
Asian	4%	1%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1%	1%
Other	2%	0%
School Status:		
In School	95%	99%
Teen Parent	1%	1%
Economically Disadvantaged	21%	32%

Source: Participation and Service Reports. The table does not include data from Campus Middle School or Springfield. National reporting system data on participant characteristics for Campus were not available, and Springfield data were reported district-wide.

Exhibit 4.2
PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS,
(Intensive Study Sites)

Participant Characteristics	High School	Middle School
Worked for pay last school year	43%	32%
Worked for pay last summer	62%	49%
Took part in extracurricular activities	77%	88%
Volunteered in last 6 months	84%	81%
Failed one or more courses last year	34%	18%
Ever Repeated a grade	33%	15%
Alcohol Use	39%	n/a
Drug Use	16%	n/a
Involved in violent behavior	39%	n/a
Ever been arrested	11%	n/a

Source: Baseline Survey, all respondents (240 high school, 159 middle school)

in some form of extracurricular activities during the six months prior to baseline (a sports team, school club, religious group, or social group). Eighty-four percent had participated in at least *some* volunteering.

But substantial proportions of the participants could also be considered "at risk." Thirty-four percent of the high school participants and 18 percent of the middle school youth had failed one or more courses in the past year, and similar proportions reported having already repeated at least one grade. Nearly 40 percent of the high school youth reported having had one or more drinks in the previous month, and 43 percent of those reported excessive alcohol use (five or more drinks at a single sitting). Forty percent also reported involvement in some form of violent behavior—a group fight, use of a knife or gun, or having hurt someone badly enough to require a doctor. Eleven percent reported having been arrested, and 16 percent reported some drug use in the previous month.

The data on participants confirms the comments of program staff in many sites that a wide variety of young people took part in school and community-based service. Even the elective programs (generally in the high schools) often contained a mix of higher and lower achieving students, or of school leaders and students who had not been active in the school before. It is worth noting that one of the benefits of the service experience mentioned by both program staff and students in several sites was this mixing of school populations that otherwise might not have an opportunity to interact.

4.2 Reasons for Joining

Given the diversity among participants, it is not surprising that participants took part in community service programs in the intensive sites for a number of different reasons. The most common reasons, according to the participants' survey responses, were a desire to "help other people" (34 percent) and "to learn new things" (26 percent). The next most common response was "Everyone in my class is participating," with 12 percent of the respondents.

In-person interviews with students across the sites added a number of reasons to the list. While many students pointed to a desire to contribute to the community or help others, others also joined to test out career ideas (for example, to see what it was like to be a teacher), to help prepare for college (by learning to work independently and manage time), because they liked a particular teacher, to gain academic credit, or to have fun with friends (see Exhibit 4.3). Clearly, for participants as well as program staff, service-learning was seen as an opportunity to address a variety of goals, interests, and needs.

4.3 The Service Experience

The experiences that the students had in the intensive study site programs also varied site by site and within sites. While several programs focused on a single service project or service site, others placed students in a wide variety of individual or small group placements.

- In Redlands, Colorado, students in the Grand Vision program learned CPR, helped to develop an educational trail along a riverfront, and organized a benefit for a community theater.

Exhibit 4.3
WHAT PARTICIPANTS SAID ABOUT WHY THEY JOINED

"I joined because it feels good to be working with friends and doing things together."

"It feels good to help someone else."

"Its fun! I like to work with the kids at the day care center."

"Because it was something different—it's nice to get out of school for a change."

"I wanted to something different and contribute. I don't like hanging around with nothing to do."

"I wanted to be outdoors, to work on the park."

"I wanted to take a course with Mr. _____ and Ms. _____."

"I will probably volunteer in the future. This will look good on a job application."

"I plan on going to the military and this will help me."

"Service learning is the only opportunity for some of us to get additional credit."

"We liked the fact that we could get out and do things"

"I like helping people—this seemed like a good thing. Also to meet new friends"

"I thought it might be interesting to get more involved. We do things that aren't boring. School is boring—you are just sitting there. Here, we are really active. There is always something different."

"I saw it as a different way to live my senior year: flexible schedule, diversity, three days a week in the community, but also a good time finding out what's out there."

"I thought it would help the transition to college."

"I wanted to get an idea what it would be like teaching."

- At the Campus Middle School, students bagged and distributed surplus food for a local food bank, acted as play pals for children at a day care center, and visited senior citizens in a nursing home.

- Students in the SITES program in North Olmsted tutored elementary school students, volunteered at area hospitals and nursing homes, worked as teaching assistants at a school for developmentally disabled children, and organized an annual, community-wide festival for senior citizens (Senior Fest).

- Students at Centennial High School worked with landscape architects, school staff, and the school's neighbors to landscape the school's grounds, while students at Britten's Neck High school also worked to create a park for the community.

- Lancaster High School's students worked at the police department and public library, as well as area day care and counseling centers and the local hospital.

Most service experiences took place in three major service categories: education, human services, and community improvement. Nearly half of the high school participants surveyed, and between 23 and 35 percent of the middle school students, reported having been involved in service in each of those areas. The national reporting data for the intensive study site programs as a whole (which includes students who were ***not*** included in the surveys), confirms this: approximately 70 percent of the reported service hours were concentrated in those three categories (Exhibit 4.4).

As suggested in the previous chapter, the ***average hours of service*** varied substantially, with a significant differences between the hours reported for middle school and high school programs. Depending on the source used, the high school students in the intensive study sites had between two and four times as many direct service hours as middle school-aged participants.[1]

---

1. There are several sources of information on student service hours which are not, unfortunately, directly comparable. The participant surveys used in the evaluation asked students to report on their volunteer hours for the previous 6 months. On those surveys, high school students reported an average of 85 hours of service, compared to 19 hours reported by middle school youth. However, that data includes hours not associated with the Serve-America program. The national reporting data (Participation and Service Reports) collected information on service hours directly associated with each program (but including participants not included in the evaluation's sample). Those reports showed an average of 64 hours of service for high school-aged participants vs. 36 hours for middle school students. While the figures differ, the important point here is the fact that high school students were involved in substantially more hours than their middle school counterparts.

Exhibit 4.4
PARTICIPATION AND HOURS OF SERVICE BY SERVICE AREA
(INTENSIVE SITES)

Service Area	Percent of Participants[a]		Percent of Service Hours[b]
	High School	Middle School	
Education	48%	23%	17%
Community Improvement	47%	35%	34%
Human Services	45%	26%	22%
Environment	13%	9%	8%
Disaster Response	1%	4%	n/a
Public Safety	8%	14%	3%
Other	33%	40%	9%

Source: Participant surveys and Participation and Service Reports. Participation and Service Report data do not include Springfield or Campus Middle School.

[a] Based on participant surveys.
[b] Based on national reporting data.

4.4 THE QUALITY OF THE SERVICE EXPERIENCE

While the type and number of hours of service a participant performs is clearly an important element in the overall service experience, researchers and service-learning advocates have also argued that the ***quality*** of the service experience is a key factor in determining program impact -- that is, that the service experience needs to provide a meaningful opportunity to learn and grow. According to several sets of criteria developed by practitioners in the service field, effective service-learning programs need to:

- engage students in "responsible and challenging actions;"
- provide structured opportunities for preparation and reflection and involve youth (and beneficiaries) in project planning;

- incorporate adult guidance and supervision; and
- provide opportunities to learn new skills and test new roles.[2]

In order to assess the degree to which the participants' service experiences met these quality criteria, the participant surveys included series of questions on the character of the service experience. In one group of questions, students were asked, overall, how satisfied they were with their community service experience, whether they perceived the service as helpful, and whether their service included participation in project planning, time for reflection, and opportunities to learn new skills. A second series of questions asked about a number of specific characteristics of the participant's service experience.[3]

The responses to the first group of questions are presented in Exhibit 4.5, separately for participants in the high school-aged and middle school-aged programs. In general, they present a very positive response by participants to their service experience:

1. ***Overall, the vast majority of students found their service experience to be positive and satisfying.*** Ninety-six percent of the high school students and over 75 percent of middle school youth indicated that they were satisfied and that the service performed was seen as helpful to the community and the individuals served. Equally high proportions believed that students should be encouraged to participate in service, though less than half thought that service should be required.

2. ***A majority of students also felt that they had learned from their service experience.*** 85 percent of the high school participants and 66 percent of the middle school students indicated that they had learned a skill that would be useful in the future. A smaller, but still substantial, percentage indicated that they had learned more or much more through their service experience than through a typical class at school.

3. ***Most students had an opportunity to discuss their service experience as part of their project, but far fewer played an active role in the design of their projects.*** Seventy-seven percent of the high school respondents and 73 percent of those in the

2. See the "Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning," in Kendall, *Combining Service and Learning*. The Principles were developed by a consortium of community service practitioners in the late 1980s. Also see the "Standards of Quality for School-Based Service-Learning," developed by the Alliance for Service-Learning in Education Reform in 1993. The "Standards" are available through the Constitutional Rights Foundation.

3. These questions are based on the Service Experience scale from Conrad and Hedin, *Experiential Education Evaluation Project*.

Exhibit 4.5
SERVICE PROGRAM EXPERIENCE

Characteristic	High School (Percent)[a]	Middle School (Percent)[a]
Very satisfied with community service experience	96.4	85.4
Service performed was very helpful to community	95.9	77.7
Service performed was very helpful to individuals served	96.4	83.5
Learned a skill that will be useful in future	85.2	65.7
Students should be encouraged to participate in community service	93.8	84.7
Students should be required to participate in community service	43.5	41.4
Work was conducted as part of a team	80.5	85.6
Involved in design of community service project	33.7	37.9
Community service project included time in class to talk about service experience	77.2	73.0
Kept a journal or diary as part of community service project	54.4	10.2
Developed really good personal relationship with someone during community service experience	76.7	33.3
Developed good relationship with:		
Supervisor at community service site	29.9	9.7
Another adult working at the site	21.3	7.8
A teacher	27.4	6.8
Another student working at the same site	36.5	14.6
A service beneficiary	37.1	9.7
Other	5.1	3.9
Learned more or much more during community service experience than in a typical class taken in school	71.1	51.5

Sample Sizes: High school: 104; middle school: 197. Sample sizes for individual items vary slightly due to item nonresponse.

[a] Percentages do not sum to 100 because participants engaged in multiple service activities.

middle schools indicated that they had class time for discussion, but less than 40 percent in either group felt they had an opportunity to participate in program design. Roughly half of the high school students also reported having kept a journal as part of their service project--another common element in structured reflection—but only 10 percent of the middle school students had done so.

4. Finally, ***a relatively high percentage of the high school students reported having established a good personal relationship with another individual during the service experience, most commonly with another student or a service beneficiary***. The figures for the middle school students are far lower (33 percent), likely reflecting the more limited time spent in service and the fact that younger students tended to perform service as part of a larger group.

The second set of questions suggests a somewhat more mixed assessment of the service experience (Exhibit 4.6). On average, the responses to the questions by the high school-aged participants indicate that the majority of those youth experienced many of the elements of a quality service experience. Approximately 60 percent of the students or more reported experiencing challenging tasks, making important decisions, having an adult take a personal interest in them, and having the freedom to explore his or her own interests either "fairly often" or "very often." A somewhat lower percentage, but still more than half, felt they had real responsibilities, discussed their work with their teachers, did things themselves, had the freedom to develop their own ideas, and had a chance to perform variety of tasks. Finally, less than 30 percent reported needing more help from their supervisors, and relatively few (13 percent) indicated that adults had criticized them or their work.

For the middle school-aged participants, in most instances, the figures were somewhat lower. While 60 percent felt they had real responsibilities "fairly often" or "very often," only 46 percent felt they had challenging tasks and 39 percent felt they made important decisions. Overall, the middle school responses suggest that younger students had fewer opportunities to engage others and take responsibility than older participants.

The mixed nature of the response to these questions appears to accurately reflect the varied nature of the service experience itself. Programs in the intensive study sites varied in the degree to which students participated in planning their projects, the structure of the reflection process (and the degree to which there was structured reflection) and the variety of tasks that students were exposed to. Several of these design elements are captured in the questions. Participants' service experiences also varied widely from service site to service site in terms of

Exhibit 4.6
CHARACTERISTICS OF SERVICE EXPERIENCE
(Percent responding "very often" or "fairly often")

Characteristics	High School (Percent)	Middle School (Percent)
Had challenging tasks	67.5	45.6
Made important decisions	65.0	38.8
Adults at site took a personal interest in me	59.4	38.8
Had freedom to explore my own interests	59.4	34.0
Had a variety of tasks to do at site	54.8	44.7
Had real responsibilities	54.3	60.2
Did things myself instead of observing	53.8	46.6
Had freedom to develop and use my own ideas	53.8	48.5
Discussed my experiences with teachers	52.9	42.7
Discussed my experiences with family and friends	46.2	48.5
Felt I made a contribution	41.1	54.4
Needed more help from my supervisor	28.9	24.3
Adults criticized me or my work	12.7	15.5

Sample Sizes: High School: 197; middle school: 104. Sample sizes for individual items vary slightly due to item nonresponse.

the kinds of service that students performed, the degree of interaction with adult supervisors, and the extent to which the service work itself involved exposure to new people and situations. For example, some service projects brought students face to face on a regular basis with senior citizens, Alzheimer's patients, disabled children, or low-income students. Based on the comments by participants who were interviewed during our site visits, those types of experiences were often particularly challenging and thought-provoking. Other assignments—helping in the

public library or working on the community park—may have involved substantially less interaction with adults or exposure to new and challenging situations. While the work was appropriate and often important, it may also have provided fewer opportunities for independent action and growth.

Two points are important to recognize in this regard. The first is that even for students whose service experience was less than fully engaging, enthusiasm and support for the program were generally strong, as the questions on overall satisfaction suggest. In large part, students recognized that not all jobs were equally interesting or exciting, and that making a contribution and having fun were not always synonymous. The second point, however, is the central role that quality service sites can play in determining the success or failure of local Serve-America programs. The selection, orientation, and supervision of the service sites is clearly an area to which local programs should pay particular attention.

Perhaps the most striking response in this set of questions is the relatively low percentage of high school-aged youth (41 percent) who responded that they made a contribution fairly or very often. This particular answer appears to contradict the much higher percentage of youth who felt that their service was "very helpful" to the community and individuals served. One possible interpretation is that this latter question better reflects students' awareness of the scale of the task facing most volunteers and communities. While students were overwhelmingly able to say, "what I did was helpful," a substantial number may have also recognized that there was much more work to be done.

4.5 Implications for the Evaluation

The data on the participant service experiences are important for several reasons. First, while participant satisfaction is not a substitute for program impacts, it is clear that participants were largely satisfied with their service experiences, and that the majority of participants were engaged in programs that had at least some of the widely accepted elements of effective service. Given that the intensive study site programs, and Serve-America programs generally, are relatively young, the development and implementation of these programs represents an important achievement. While all the impacts that program sponsors might hope for may not be readily evident in these sites, it is clear that on average the intensive study site programs have been successfully implemented and are providing a generally positive experience.

The data on service experience are also important, as the following chapter will discuss, because in several instances they are closely related to the actual impacts of the programs themselves. As the following chapter will show, the degree to which community service programs have an impact on participant attitudes, involvement in service, and academic performance are clearly related to the intensity and quality of the service experience.

CHAPTER FIVE
IMPACTS ON PARTICIPANTS

The primary goal of Serve-America is to involve school-aged youth in service to help them develop as ***citizens***, through an increased sense of civic responsibility and a commitment to community involvement; as ***students***, through improved school performance and academic skills; and as ***individuals***, through increased self-esteem and self-confidence and reduced involvement in risk behavior.

How successful were Serve-America programs in meeting those ambitious goals? To a surprising degree, given the limited nature of the intervention, Serve-America programs *were* able to affect the attitudes and behaviors of program participants. Particularly for high-school aged participants, whose programs tended to provide a more intensive service experience, Serve-America had a positive impact on a number of critical measures:

Among the seven high school programs, the evaluation found significant positive impacts on seven measures:

- school attendance
- personal and social responsibility
- involvement in volunteer service
- hours of volunteer service
- likelihood of future service
- communications skills, and
- work orientation

The impacts on school attendance and the hours of volunteer service were particularly striking, with high school students showing 20 percent fewer days absent from school and over 300 percent more hours of service than a comparison group of students who were not involved in service programs.

Impacts on students in middle school programs were more limited, reflecting the more limited hours and intensity of most middle school programs. Among those students, the evaluation found significant positive impacts on three measures:

- school attendance
- hours of homework, and
- hours of volunteer service

comparison group members); 162 youth in the sample (75 participants, 87 comparison group members) were from the middle school sites.[2]

Interpreting the Findings

One of the critical decisions made early in the design of the evaluation was the decision to cast a relatively broad net in terms of the range of potential impacts to be examined in the participant impact study. The literature on community service and service learning points to a wide range of expected or demonstrated impacts, each of which can be measured in a variety of ways. Rather than focus on one or two central measures for service as a whole, or for each broad domain, we decided to make use of a variety of measures in an effort to capture a wider array of potential impacts. Between the survey data and the school record information, the evaluation ultimately collected information on over 25 distinct outcome measures.[3]

With such a long list of indicators, the temptation is to look at the impact study results as a scorecard or a batting average—looking at what percentage of the measures generated positive results. However, that kind of approach is not appropriate in this instance. Where there is no clear agreement on a single set of measures, and where there is substantial variation in program design, the assessment of the participant impact data needs to focus on ***which measures demonstrated impact*** and on ***the balance of positive and negative impacts.*** In that regard, the outcomes reported in this chapter are consistently positive, though limited in number.

5.2 Impacts on Civic and Social Development

The evaluation examined an array of measures of civic and social development, including scales measuring attitudes towards personal and social responsibility, communications skills, work orientation, acceptance of cultural diversity, and general social values. Students in the high school-aged programs demonstrated small, but statistically significant impacts on three

---

2. On individual questions, the numbers in the analysis pool may be smaller because of missing data. In order to provide the largest possible sample for the analysis of school record data, the sample included students for whom matched baseline and followup school roster data were available, even if matched survey data were not available for those students. See Appendix C for information on the analysis sample.

3. See Appendix B for a brief review of the research literature. The outcomes measures used in the study are described in greater detail in Appendix D.

of those measures: personal and social responsibility, communications skills, and work orientation. There were no statistically significant impacts for the middle school students on any of the scales. The results for the various civic and social development scales are shown in Exhibit 5.1.

Impacts on Social Responsibility, Communications Skills, and Work Maturity

The Personal and Social Responsibility scale was developed to assess attitudes in three broad areas: attitudes towards helping others (the Social Welfare subscale), attitudes towards community and political involvement (Community Involvement subscale), and attitudes towards environmental activity (Environment subscale). Students were asked to indicate for each of a series of questions the degree to which an issue, such as "helping people without being paid" or "cleaning up parks or helping with other environmental projects" was something that should be done or that they felt responsible for doing.[4]

The Communications scale is a series of questions aimed at assessing a student's confidence and maturity in interactions with other individuals. Students were asked to agree or disagree with statements such as "It is hard to talk to someone you don't know" or "I do not mix well with other people." Similarly, the Work Orientation scale asked students to agree or disagree with statements about work and work habits, such as "Hard work is never fun" or "No one should expect you to do work that you don't like."[5]

On all three of these scales, the data show a positive impact for high school students, though the magnitude of the impacts is relatively small. Participants show a 4-6 percent higher average score on those scales than comparison group members, after adjustments for differences between the two groups at baseline. While small, the differences are statistically significant and

4. The Personal and Social Responsibility Scale was developed by the Search Institute for use in its evaluation of the National Service Learning Initiative. The Search scale builds on an earlier scale developed for the Conrad and Hedin experiential education evaluation. See Dan Conrad and Diane Hedin, *Instruments and Scoring Guide of the Experiential Education Evaluation Project* (St. Paul: Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota, 1981) for the original instrument.

5. The Communications and Work Orientation scales are drawn from the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory developed by Ellen Greenberger and Lloyd Bond. See Greenberger and Bond, *User's Manual for the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory*, 1984.

Exhibit 5.5
EDUCATION ASPIRATIONS

Characteristic	Comparison Group Distribution at Followup (1)	Program Group Distribution at Followup (2)	Statistically Significant? (3)
High School Sample			
Education aspirations			
How far would you like to go in school if you could?			
Drop out of high school before graduation	0.0	1.2	
Get a GED	1.0	1.2	
Graduate from high school	9.3	5.4	
Graduate from a 2-year college	11.3	6.2	
Graduate from a 4-year college	33.7	37.8	
Attend graduate school (eg., Masters's, Ph.D.)	44.8	48.2	No
Middle School Sample			
Education aspirations			
How far would you like to go in school if you could?			
Drop out of high school before graduation	1.5	0.0	
Get a GED	1.3	0.0	
Graduate from high school	2.6	1.4	
Graduate from a 2-year college	3.1	5.6	
Graduate from a 4-year college	34.3	25.0	
Attend graduate school (eg., Masters's, Ph.D.)	57.2	68.1	No

Exhibit 5.6
EDUCATION EXPECTATIONS

Characteristic	Comparison Group Distribution at Followup (1)	Program Group Distribution at Followup (2)	Statistically Significant? (3)
High School Sample			
Education expectations			
How far would you expect to go in school?			
Drop out of high school before graduation	0.9	1.2	
Get a GED	2.6	0.0	
Graduate from high school	11.3	9.6	
Graduate from a 2-year college	11.8	8.4	
Graduate from a 4-year college	46.6	44.6	
Attend graduate school (eg., Masters's, Ph.D.)	26.8	36.2	No
Middle School Sample			
Education expectations			
How far would you expect to go in school?			
Drop out of high school before graduation	1.6	0.0	
Get a GED	0.2	0.0	
Graduate from high school	2.6	5.5	
Graduate from a 2-year college	3.1	6.8	
Graduate from a 4-year college	44.8	30.1	
Attend graduate school (eg., Masters's, Ph.D.)	47.6	57.5	No

Exhibit 5.7
HOURS SPENT DOING HOMEWORK

Characteristic	Comparison Group Distribution at Followup (1)	Program Group Distribution at Followup (2)	Statistically Significant? (3)
High School Sample			
Hours spent doing homework in average week			
0 hours	13 8	9.8	
1-2 hours	28.0	23.4	
3-5 hours	35.9	40.4	
6-10 hours	16.4	22.8	
11 hours or more	5.9	3.6	No
Middle School Sample			
Hours spent doing homework in average week			
0 hours	7.3	0.0	
1-2 hours	30.1	19.2	
3-5 hours	44.0	32.9	
6-10 hours	16.8	35.6	
11 hours or more	1.7	12.3	Yes**

homework (another measure of school engagement) and educational aspirations and expectations also showed no significant impacts.[10]

The evaluation also examined school records on course failures and grade point averages for high school-aged students.[11] Here again, no significant impact was found.

The fact that Serve-America programs at the high school level were able to affect attendance but not academic achievement or engagement is consistent with our observations both of the programs and of academic achievement itself. By and large, students interviewed at the intensive study sites expressed a strong interest, commitment, and loyalty to their service programs and, in many instances, to the adults who staffed the programs. That attachment, and the sense of responsibility many participants appeared to feel for their service assignments, was seen at the local level as being strong enough to have brought young people to school on a somewhat more regular basis.

At the same time, the direct effect of the community service or service learning experience on the broader academic experience was often extremely limited. While students may have become substantially more engaged and empowered within their service-related course, most of their other courses were still traditional academic programs. Because the changes in instruction were generally limited to only one course in a day full of classes, it is not surprising that the service experience failed to translate into a new attitude toward school as a whole.[12] Moreover, though service learning may help improve achievement in the course in which service is part of the instruction, few practitioners argue that it will affect overall achievement (as measured through grade point average, for example) over the short term without parallel changes in other classes.

---

10. It is worth noting that participants did report a generally higher level of educational aspirations and expectations than comparison group members, but the difference was not statistically significant.

11. An effort was also made to collect standardized test scores, where available, for students. However, data were so inconsistent from school to school, and so few schools had timely "before" and "after" data, that the test scores were not included in the analysis.

12. In this regard, it is worth recalling that 71 percent of the high school students said they had learned more in their community service program than through their regular classes.

Middle School Participants

For middle school students, service appears to have had a positive and significant impact on attendance and hours spent doing homework. Middle school records indicate that participants missed an average of 2.6 fewer days of school each semester than members of the comparison group (a 35 percent difference). Based on survey responses, middle school participants also spent significantly more hours on their homework than non-participants. Both these results are consistent with the nature of the middle school service programs, in terms of both the engagement of students in group service activities and the fact that the service learning projects often involved independent research on community and social issues as part of preparation.

At the same time, as with the high school students, middle school students show no impact on the measures of education-related attitudes or on overall course failure. There was not sufficient data on middle school grade point average for a reliable analysis.[13]

In summary, the evaluation results, and the observations of the programs in the intensive study sites, suggest that in the short run, service programs are most likely to have a measurable impact on education-related behaviors—such as attendance—rather than achievement. Improved attendance is often associated with improved academic performance and school retention in the long run. But, in the absence of a longer-term followup, we cannot be sure whether the short-term gains in attendance do translate into longer-term impact on overall achievement or outcomes such as dropout rates.

5.5 Impacts on Risk Behaviors

The evaluation also looked at the degree to which participation in community service programs affected involvement in a variety of risk behaviors among high school-aged participants (questions on risk behaviors were not included in the middle school surveys). Pre- and post-program surveys included questions about alcohol and drug use, parenting, involvement in violent behavior, and arrests. In each instance, the evaluation found no significant effects

13. Of the five middle school programs in the study, only two were able to provide school record information on grade point average for analysis (Campus and Forest Park Middle Schools). Two of the other middle school programs were community-based programs and lacked comparison group data; the third (Redlands Middle School) could not provide grade point information for comparison group members. School record data from Redlands was available for the analysis of attendance and course failure.

(Exhibit 5.8). Given that relatively few of the programs targeted at-risk youth or were explicitly designed to address the issues of drug and alcohol abuse, for example, it is not surprising that there were no impacts on these outcomes.

Exhibit 5.8
ALCOHOL AND DRUG USE

Characteristic	Impact (1)	Statistically Significant (2)
High School		
Alcohol and drug use		
Consumed any alcohol in past 30 days	.6%	No
Excessive alcohol use in past 30 days	-.8%	No
Used illegal drugs in past 30 days	42.6%	No
Middle School		
Alcohol and drug use	n/a	n/a
Consumed any alcohol in past 30 days		
Excessive alcohol use in past 30 days		
Used illegal drugs in past 30 days		

Note: *Impact* (column 1) is the difference between the mean comparison group score or outcome and the mean outcome for program participants, expressed as a percentage of the comparison group mean (i.e., in percentage terms, how much higher or lower participants scored on average than comparison group members). *Statistically Significant* (column 2) indicates whether the impact listed in column 1 was statistically significant at a .05 level or greater. One asterisk indicates significance at the .05 level, two asterisks indicate significance at the .01 level.

5.6 SUBGROUP ANALYSIS

The evaluation examined a subset of potential outcomes to see if there were significant differences in impacts among subgroups in the population or among different types of programs. The purpose of the analysis was to examine whether some types of programs were more effective than others, and whether some types of participants benefited more from the program than others. Since the middle school sample was too small to provide reliable subgroup results, the subgroup analysis was limited to those sites with programs for high school-aged youth. One hundred sixty-nine participants and 166 comparison group members were included in the subgroup analysis. The impacts included in the analysis are listed in Exhibit 5.9. The full set of subgroup analysis tables are included in Appendix F.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Exhibit 5.9
OUTCOMES EXAMINED IN SUBGROUP ANALYSIS

- Personal and Social Responsibility Scale
- Psychosocial Maturity Scales (Communications, Work Orientation, Cultural Diversity)
- Engaged in any Formal Helping Behavior
- Number of Formal Helping Behaviors
- Hours per Week of Volunteer Work
- Educational Competence and Control (Connell Scale)
- Grade Point Average
- Attendance
- Course Failures
- At-Risk Behaviors (Involvement in one or more at-risk behaviors)

The evaluation examined six different sets of participant characteristics and four sets of program characteristics for differences in impacts. The participant characteristics included educationally at-risk, economically disadvantaged, male and female, racial and ethnic groups, involvement in at-risk behaviors, and prior volunteer experience.[14] Program characteristics included two sets of program design categories (integrated, service course, and afterschool; and curricular and extra-curricular), average hours of service for the program, and differences along a program experience scale based on participant answers to the characteristics of service experience questions discussed in Chapter 4 (see Exhibit 4.6).

Subgroup Analysis Findings

In general, the subgroup analysis found relatively few statistically significant differences in impacts among subgroups of participants or among program types. As the subgroup analysis

14. Data on educationally and economically disadvantaged status was collected from the schools as part of the school record data. Educationally at-risk included students who had repeated a grade, failed one or more courses in the past semester, or were deemed educationally at-risk (generally Chapter 1 eligible) by their schools. Economically disadvantaged included students eligible for free and reduced cost lunch or JTPA eligible. Students involved in at-risk behaviors were those who had answered positively to at least one of the at-risk behavior questions (alcohol, drugs, violence, teenage pregnancy). Prior volunteer experience split the sample into individuals who had more and less than the mean reported volunteer hours at baseline.

tables in Appendix F show, there were a few, scattered differences in impacts among different population groups. These were not widespread or consistent and appear more likely to reflect variations in the sample size of the subgroups than systematic differences in impacts among different populations.

There were some differences among the three major program types (service only, service courses, and service integrated into an academic course), but again, the differences were not consistent across outcomes (see Table 7 in Appendix F), and a number of these differences disappear when the programs are regrouped into curricular programs (which combines the service courses and academic programs) and extracurricular (service only) initiatives. There were also only scattered difference between programs based on average service hours, though it is important to remember that this analysis is confined to the high school programs in the study. There is a much more substantial difference in hours between high school and middle school programs than among high school programs alone, and as this chapter reports, the high school programs did produce a greater number of impacts than the middle school initiatives.

Differences in Program Experience

There were, however, significant differences on a number of measures when the quality of the service experience was taken into account. For this analysis, the high school programs were divided into two groups based on the ratings that program participants had given their service experience. The evaluation then tested whether there was a statistically significant difference in outcomes between the higher and lower rated programs. Exhibit 5.10 summarizes the results.[15]

The findings for this analysis are striking. On seven of the twelve measures in the analysis—engagement in helping behavior, number of helping behaviors, hours of service, personal and social responsibility, communications skills, work orientation, and attendance—the programs that scored higher on the program experience scale had a positive impact that was significantly larger those that scored lower. (The major areas where impact did not vary significantly with the program experience measures were two education-related measures—the

15. The service experience ratings were based on the average participant ratings on the combined set of Conrad and Hedin service experience questions discussed in Chapter 4 of this report. Programs were grouped into those above and below the average rating.

Exhibit 5.10
PROGRAM QUALITY: VARIATION IN IMPACT ON SELECTED OUTCOMES BETWEEN PROGRAMS BASED ON SERVICE EXPERIENCE MEASURES

Outcome	Test of Variation in Impact with Mean Score on Program Experience Scale
Helping Behavior:	
Engaged in any formal helping behavior	(+) *
Number of formal helping activities	(+) **
Average hours per week doing volunteer work or community service in last 6 months	(+) **
Attitudes:	
Perceived control (Connell scale)	
Personal and social responsibility	
Helping Others (social welfare)	(+) **
Community involvement	(+) *
Environmental activity	
Total Score	(+) **
Psychosocial maturity	
Communications skills	(+) **
Work orientation	(+) **
Acceptance of cultural diversity	ns
School Performance:	
Grade point average	ns
Days absent during program period	(-) **
Failed 1 or more courses during program period	ns
At-Risk Behavior:	
Use of drugs or alcohol, fighting, or teen parenting	ns

Note: For each outcome analyzed, the table shows whether the impact on that outcome varied positively (+) or negatively (-) with the Conrad and Hedin scale, and whether that variation was statistically significant. One asterisk indicates significance at the .05 level, two asterisks indicate significance at the .01 level.

Connell perceived control scale and grade point average—and the measure of involvement in at-risk behavior.) These findings tend to confirm that the degree to which programs include elements widely associated with program quality in service-learning—a challenging service experience, opportunities for independent decision-making, time for discussion (reflection), etc.—is significantly related to the likelihood of a positive impact.

Taken together, the various subgroup analyses tend to confirm a point first made by Dan Conrad and Diane Hedin in their experiential education study: that the quality of the quality of the program experience (as outlined above) is one of the strongest factors affecting program impact. While there are few consistent differences in impacts between different program types or among subgroups of participants, there are clear and consistent differences between programs that provide experiences of greater and lesser intensity (as between high school and middle school programs) and between programs that are more or less successful in providing a quality service experience.

5.7 Voices from the Field: Participants, Staff, and Others

While the surveys and school record data provide the necessary quantitative foundation for the evaluation, evaluation staff also interviewed participants, program staff, supervisors at service sites, parents, guidance counselors, and others in the course of site visits throughout the evaluation. Though not a statistically reliable sample, these interviews helped to give life and context to the quantitative data and help us to understand what the changes in scale scores might mean for program participants.

The message from these interviews is largely consistent with the quantitative data. In the eyes of these students and adults, involvement in service and service learning had provided an essentially positive experience—one that succeeded in opening their eyes to their communities, making them feel more confident about themselves, making them more sensitive to others, and helping them to think about their futures (including their future at school) in fresh ways.

In broad terms, students and adult observers talked about several kinds of impacts in the course of their interviews with evaluation staff. Those impacts included:

An increased awareness and understanding of community issues, and a perspective on where they fit in the broader society:

This program was an "eye opener" for students. It gave them some exposure to "real life." I know it gave my daughter a chance to see another side of life and to realize we don't have it so bad—don't ridicule what we have. (Parent)

[Serving meals at the Mission] makes me feel like I got a lot more. They don't have anything! I'd wash tables, meet guys. I was nervous the first time, but everyone was polite. It changed my views—it makes me feel sad society can come to that." (Student)

It makes you more thankful. (Student)

I've been very sheltered. This has given me a taste of the real world. (Student)

This teaches people that you can help other people out. Most of these children [at the elementary school] come from the projects with single parents, and they wouldn't get as much attention if it was not for me. They look up to me as a mom, which feels good. (Student)

I learned a lot about the community and its problems. I was interested in teenage pregnancy when I started, but now I see a lot of connections to other issues, too. (Student)

A sense of civic responsibility:

I learned commitment. (Student)

Once you get into service you want to get going. You feel obligated, and end up working more hours than required. (Student)

The program is doing what we thought it would do. It has started to give students a sense of giving to someone else. Kids really like volunteering—then they are not the only ones with problems. (School Principal)

Students have wanted to keep working with the agencies. During spring break, students didn't have to come in, but they did anyway. (Program Staff)

Some of the kids are the least likely people. I assumed they would only think about themselves, but they are putting out for others. Its nice to see. (Math Teacher)

I have learned that there are differences between people, and if it weren't for volunteer work, some things would not get done. (Student)

Increased respect and tolerance for others, and an increased capacity to work with other people:

The students learn to relate to adults in a work setting—not as parents or teachers, but as adults. (Service Site Supervisor)

This program challenges their [students'] stereotypes—they are surprised to find that homeless aren't so bad. (Shelter Director)

The elder sites just blow away preconceived notions; elders have a lot to give back. (Program Staff)

The trip to Appalachia really has an impact. These are kids who drive through a poor neighborhood and roll up the windows. Now they are going into houses with 100 chickens. (Program Staff)

Service breaks down the "us" and "them" mentality, bringing different students together and breaking down assumptions about those in need. (Program Staff)

I learned respect for people. (Student)

You become more sensitive to discrimination and needs for assistance. (Student)

It's given me a new realization about old people. They're not just grumpy old people. They've lived life and enjoy you, contrary to popular belief. (Student)

It helped me learn how to deal with people. Made me more sensitive—not to pick on people. (Student)

It made me more tolerant. I've become good friends with others in the group. This group has taught me how to get along with other people. (Student)

Before, I was irresponsible, always picking on other people. Now I know people. (Student)

I know that if you "" to seniors, they get mad! (Student)

When you talk to people, how quickly stereotypes go away. (Student)

In the end, the kids got more than they gave—it was a real growth experience. (Parent)

6.1 Creating Expanded Community Service Opportunities and Permanent Programs

One of the basic goals of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 was to expand the opportunity for community service by creating new and permanent service programs around the country. As outlined in the Commission's first annual report, a fundamental part of the federal strategy was ultimately to establish programs in every district in the country to act as focal points for further expansion. To what extent, then, have the Serve-America grants succeeded in fostering the establishment of new, or the expansion of existing community service programs? To what degree are those programs likely to persist after the completion of the grant?

The experience of the intensive study sites indicates that the first of these goals is, in large part, being met. In eight of the thirteen intensive study sites, the initial 1992-93 Serve-America grants resulted in the establishment of new programs in the school or community-based organization. In four of the other five sites, the grants resulted in the expansion or significant strengthening of existing service-related efforts (for example, by providing a full or part-time service coordinator in the school who expanded services or helped to develop new curriculum linkages). In only one of the sites does it appear that Serve-America funds were essentially used to continue unchanged a program that had previously been established.

On a national basis, Serve-America also appears to have fostered substantial new program development. It is difficult to establish clearly on a national basis how many of the individual programs funded by Serve-America are "new" because of differences in definition and perception from community to community. However, data from the national reporting system do suggest that much of the activity funded under Serve-America did represent a net addition to the prior stock of community service programs. For the 1993-94 program year (the first year for which full national reporting data are available), 76 percent of the projects reported that they were new projects or expansions of existing projects. Most of the balance (22 percent) indicated that they were continuations of existing efforts.[1]

A more difficult question to answer within the time frame of this evaluation is whether Serve-America funds resulted in programs that are likely to persist after completion of the grant.

---

1. Based on Project Description Forms submitted for the national reporting system. Programs were asked to indicate whether the project was "a new project" (i.e., one that began under CNCS funding); "expansion of an existing project" (in which CNCS funds were used to add new elements or substantially modify the objectives of an existing program); or "continuation of an existing project" (where there were no changes in the basic design features).

As of the fall of 1994, seven of the thirteen intensive study sites continued to receive CNCS funding as a major source of funding for their community service activities. Thus, the question concerning their long-term survival beyond their grant support cannot be answered with any degree of certainty.

In six of the intensive study sites, however, CNCS funding was not renewed. The experience of those sites suggests that in a surprising number of cases, the service learning programs have been able to survive the loss of funding, and that there are at least some lasting benefits even in those instances where the formal program has ended. In four of those sites (Campus, Toledo, Medway, and Britten's Neck), the local programs are continuing intact and even expanding despite the end to CNCS funding:

- During the period of grant support, Campus Middle School expanded its 8th grade community service learning program from one to all four of the school's 8th grade clusters, with the grant paying part of the salary of one teacher as a service coordinator. The program is continuing this year with the service coordinator continuing her role on a voluntary basis.

- Toledo's Magic Makers program, operated by the Girl Scouts in partnership with Libbey High School, lost its funding for 1994-95 because of the changes in the legislation governing community-based programs. The program has received local United Way support for one year and is expanding to a second school, though prospects for longer term support are not clear.[2]

- The Medway High School Community Service Learning Course is also continuing in 1994-95 using local school funds to pay the teacher's salary. The school is also attempting to organize an in-service program for teachers on the integration of community service into academic instruction.

- In Britten's Neck, the community service effort to build a community park was an integral part of the high school's agricultural sciences program. During the two-year grant period, Serve-America funds were used largely for equipment used at the park and for recognition activities for participating students. Work on the park will continue as part of the agricultural science classes.

2. As noted previously, Magic Makers was originally funded as a school-based program. The Toledo Public Schools was the official grant recipient and subcontracted with the Girl Scout Council to operate the program at the school. Under the new Learn and Serve program, the state of Ohio determined that Magic Makers should be funded through funds for community-based organizations rather than school-based programs, but had no funds available for those types of programs. As of January 1994, the Girl Scouts did not know if the United Way funding could be renewed.

In two other sites (Fall River and Teenline), loss of Serve-America funds has resulted in the disappearance of the community service program as a distinct operation. In both instances, however, local staff do point to elements of the program that will continue:

- In Columbia, South Carolina, staff at Teenline are continuing to organize community service activities for middle school students as part of their efforts under a new drug abuse prevention grant. The Serve-America experience, they suggest, provided an opportunity to develop an approach and set of activities that they will make use of in other program settings.

- In Fall River, the public housing authority and the nonprofit Citizens for Citizens (two of the partners in the Fall River initiative) are continuing to pursue several of the community service projects originated under their grant. The peer leadership program operated by Citizens now includes community service (in the form of presentations at public schools), and the youth program at the public housing authority is continuing the "Vial of Life" activities (in which students help senior citizens make a record of their medications in case of emergency) which began under the grant.

Finally, in several sites—most notably Redlands Middle School, Centennial High School, and North Olmsted—school-based community service activities have generated a level of support such that local administrators are confident that the programs will continue beyond their grant funding:

- At Redlands, the school's "Grand Vision" school-wide community service program has become an integral part of that school's "community school" approach to education. In that context, the school's principal asserts that community service is "here to stay."

- At Centennial High School, community service work in the neighborhood (landscaping school grounds, etc.) has also become an integral part of that alternative high school's academic program. The school has begun to leverage significant local resources (including an Americorps grant) in support of ongoing efforts.

- At North Olmsted High School, the SITES program has generated a regular flow of positive support for the school from the media, community groups, and the school board. The program has doubled in size since its inception (growing from 60 to 120 students) and, in the words of the new principal at the high school, "it would be difficult to eliminate at this point, it has gotten so many strokes."

Taken together, the experience of the intensive study sites suggests that, more often than not, the initial Serve-America grants have resulted in the establishment of programs that are

likely to have a lifetime beyond the initial period of grant support. While it is too early to assess the long-term viability of these programs, in most of the sites clear efforts are being made to ensure the continued operation of the Serve-America program or its central elements. Given the relatively small size of the initial grants and the short gestation period for these programs, the establishment of these programs represents a significant accomplishment and reflects the commitment of the individual teachers and administrators who have worked to put them into place.

6.2 Changing Schools as Institutions

The second major set of institutional impact questions for Serve-America concern the degree to which the Serve-America grants resulted in a broader impact on the school and/or school district in which the programs operated. For many of the supporters of the 1990 community service legislation, one of the purposes of the Serve-America grants was to introduce community service as a vehicle for a broader changes in instruction and the relationship between schools and communities. In terms of instructional approach, service learning has been seen as an important example of hands-on learning in which students have an opportunity to apply academic skills in "real world" situations with teachers acting as coaches and facilitators for the learning process. At the institutional level, community service learning is also seen as a means of better linking schools and communities by establishing new relationships between schools and non-school organizations.

To address these issues in the intensive study sites, the evaluation examined four basic questions concerning the broader institutional impacts of service:

- To what extent did the CNCS grant lead to the expansion of community service or service learning within the school beyond the initial program?
- To what extent did the presence of the community service grant raise awareness, interest and support for service in the school as a whole or affect the overall culture of the school?
- Did individual, school-based community service programs have an impact beyond the school building on other schools in the district?
- D'd the program change the school's relationship with the surrounding community?

On these issues, the experience of the intensive study sites varied widely, depending in part on the structure of the program and on the personalities and skills of the individuals coordinating the local efforts. In broad terms, while several of the programs have begun to affect instructional practices within their school building and have established good relationships with outside organizations, few evidenced any broader impacts on school culture (with the exception of the whole school efforts) or impact on community service beyond their home school. What was striking throughout all the sites, in fact, was the limited degree to which community service was perceived as a vehicle for educational reform and the relative paucity of local efforts to spread knowledge of the service program more widely among teachers and students in the district.

In reviewing these findings, it is again important to recognize the relatively short timeframe involved in evaluating this aspect of Serve-America. As noted earlier, this type of institutional change is often a relatively slow process involving not only the establishment of the "pilot" program, but constituency-building, curriculum design, and professional development. Even where there is widespread agreement on a curriculum change, the process often takes several years before it is fully reflected in classroom practices. In that regard, most of the Serve-America sites are still at the beginning of the first stage of the process: the programs have been established, but the constituency-building has only just begun. It seems clear at this point that if more extensive institutional changes are to take place a more proactive approach may be appropriate. But it is equally clear that it is much too early in the process to expect major institutional changes to have already taken place.

Expansion within the School

While a number of the community service programs expanded in size or scope during the period of the evaluation, there was little evidence of broader institutional change within the participating schools. In only three of the programs, Campus and Redlands Middle Schools and the Medway High School, did additional teachers begin to include community service activities within their classes or integrate service learning into their instructional approach. More often than not, CNCS-funded programs operated as relatively isolated islands within the larger institution of the school. (See Exhibit 6.1.)

There were a number of reasons for this relative absence of institutional impacts. First, in the case of the afterschool programs, there was little contact between program staff and the teachers in the school. In the case of both Toledo's Magic Makers and Lancaster's Community

Exhibit 6.1
BUILDING-LEVEL IMPACTS

Site	Adoption by Others within school	Other Impacts
Campus Middle School	Yes	Program expanded from one to four clusters in 8th grade, with program coordinator moving to a new cluster each year as means of expansion. Not adopted at other grade levels.
Redlands Middle School	Yes	Increased staff buy-in, integration into other academic courses. One-day in-service on advisory and service learning.
Springfield	No	Service adopted on an ad hoc basis. Primary support for expansion from a local bank grant.
Centennial	No	Limited growth beyond original group of teachers interested in implementing.
Fall River	No	Out-of-school/afterschool program: no links to any Fall River Schools.
Medway	Yes	Established Advisory Council to involve additional teachers. Seeking funding for in-service training on integrating service into academic courses.
North Olmsted	No	Course expanded to two sessions. No effort to involve additional teachers/staff.
Toledo	No	Afterschool program: no faculty interest/involvement.
Lancaster	No	Afterschool program: no impact on other courses. One science course to add service component (as result of personal contacts with teacher).
Britten's Neck	No	No impact on other courses.

Service Learning Program, program staff were not regular school staff, were uncertified, and did not participate in school faculty meetings. In Fall River, though the program was a school/community partnership, program staff were essentially community-based, operating out of a site away from any school buildings. While the afterschool programs were generally considered easier to implement (because there was no need to alter the school schedule or provide for early release to conduct service activities), their structure made it unlikely that they would have any impact within the school itself.[3]

Second, community service programs also encountered both indifference and overt hostility on the part of other teachers in the building. In a number of sites, teachers made it clear that, while they supported community service, they had no time to bring it into their own classrooms if not required to do so:

> *"I have more to do than I can handle. I think those whose curriculum includes [service learning] should be the ones to deal with it. I can't leave my class."*

In other sites, it was argued (by both teachers and administrators) that teachers are simply "slow to change." In one site it was pointed out that roughly 60 percent of the faculty members were within five years of retirement, and were unlikely to introduce new methods at this stage in their careers. In another site, a frustrated administrator simply noted: "There is no interest on the part of teachers to look at different educational methods."

In several sites, new community service programs prompted active hostility from other members of the school faculty. Faculty complaints centered on the granting of credit for service time (and the perceived dilution of academic standards), early release time for students, time spent "off campus" by teachers involved in the program, and the granting of credit in courses taught by non-union instructors.[4] While building administrators generally dismissed these complaints, in at least one case the objections to the program discouraged program staff from any efforts to involve additional teachers or to encourage the expansion of service learning in the school.

---

3. The experience of the Teenline program was also consistent with this. Though a community-based program, Teenline's activities took place within school buildings. However, as part of an afterschool program, Teenline had little contact with school administrators, and was generally unknown among teachers.

4. A typical comment was that students who were released from school for service "go hang around and try to get away with something." At one program, a mailing from the program staff to all teachers failed to generate any inquiries from school staff, but did result in the filing of a grievance by the union concerned that credit was being granted without active involvement of a regular teacher.

A third major reason, and perhaps the most important, was the relative absence of in-service training or any other formal mechanisms for conveying either the benefits or techniques of community service. Of the ten school-based intensive study sites, only Redlands Middle School and the Springfield Public Schools made any effort to conduct formal in-service programs on community service learning. Only two others, Campus and Medway, had taken other formal steps to encourage expansion. As a result, the community service programs, particularly those in the high schools and after school, operated in relative isolation. At one site, a department chair noted that the community service program is "almost like some separate entity." He went on to comment that:

> *"When [the program] was finally presented at a Principal's Forum, I saw the video made for the program for the first time. Not one person on our staff has seen the videotape!"*

At several other sites, despite the strong support for the programs by school administrators, there had never been formal presentations at regular faculty meetings or discussions on how to expand the involvement of other faculty in the program.

The importance of some formal mechanism for involving other faculty is highlighted by those sites in which the expansion of service learning had taken place:

- In Redlands, as noted above, there had been formal (though brief) in-service training for school staff. There, the result was a growing staff "buy-in" into service learning and an improved understanding of what service learning actually was. During the two years covered by the evaluation, the program coordinator noted an increased number of teachers volunteering for the "Day of Caring" (the major, school-wide service event) and a growing number of courses integrating service activities into their lessons. Even with the in-service training, a number of teachers at Redlands reported still feeling "unprepared" to include service in the curriculum and needing further assistance.

- At the Campus Middle School, service learning was spread by the deliberate strategy of assigning the school's service coordinator to a different teaching team each year. Having piloted the program within her own cluster in the first year of the grant, the coordinator then moved into new clusters in each of the following two years until the use of service learning was grade-wide.

- At Medway High School, the service learning teacher took two steps to build support and interest within the school. The first was the creation of a number of service sites within the school building—for example, tutoring special education students—as a means of acquainting other teachers with the service program and its students. The second step was the creation of an advisory group of academic

teachers to involve them directly in the design and oversight of the program. The result has been a substantial increase of interest among school staff and the tentative planning of an in-service program for school staff on integrating service into academic subjects.

Finally, the impact of the CNCS grant on other teachers depended in part on the structure of the program and the organization of middle and high schools. In general, middle schools are more amenable to grade-wide or school-wide efforts, and the team teaching/cluster approach widely used in middle schools lends itself to the transmission of new teaching strategies. In contrast, traditional high schools are relatively fragmented, with each teacher master in his or her own classroom. In those instances, and particularly where programs operate outside of school hours, a more formal dissemination effort needs to take place for there to be any impact from a single program or classroom on the school as a whole. In the instance of the Serve-America grants, those types of efforts were largely absent, resulting in a limited impact on the participating schools.

Impact on School Culture

As the foregoing suggests, while each of the programs had some visibility in the school, there appears to have been little impact on the school culture as a whole. Interviews with school administrators, teachers, and a limited number of students suggest that, in most sites, the overall level of awareness of the programs was low and service was only one element in the overall school culture. The major exception to this was in the school-wide programs: Redlands and Centennial High School. In both schools, all students took part in service activities, and in both programs service was considered a part of the school mission from the beginning.

District-Wide Impacts

As with the in-school impacts, impacts beyond the school housing the Serve-America program were also limited. In Springfield, a number of schools have become involved in service learning as a result of a deliberate district-wide effort. In only one other site (Lancaster) have new programs in other schools begun as a result of the initial Serve-America grants. In that community, the lead contact for the high school-based Serve-America program was the district grant coordinator, who took the lead in working to establish additional programs in a second high school, a middle school, and an elementary school beginning in 1994-95.

While preliminary, there are indications in three other districts of a growing interest in service learning. In Englewood, Colorado, where the Campus Middle School is located, there has been an effort to include service within the district's social studies "proficiencies," and in Grand Junction (Redlands) and Fort Collins (Centennial), schools in each district have begun asking for information on service learning and assistance in starting their own programs.

Two points are important here. The first is that whatever expansion has taken place has been slow and tentative in nature. While schools in several communities have asked for information and assistance from the original Serve-America site, the road from inquiry to operating program is a long one, and there is no guarantee at this early stage that the inquiries will result in new local efforts.

The more important point is that, again, with few exceptions there are no organized efforts to help service learning expand within the intensive study site's school districts. In the majority of sites, there was little if any involvement in the program by the district-level administration. Within the programs there was little sense that expansion to other schools had to be part of the program mission. In the same way that community service was often isolated within the school building, school-based projects were largely isolated from the district at large.

School Relationship with the Community

It is difficult to accurately assess the degree to which the Serve-America programs have changed the relationship with the community, in part because of the diffuseness of "community" and because of the difficulty in assessing community attitudes beyond those of individuals directly involved in the service activities. (See the section on Community Impacts in Chapter Seven for host agency assessments of service activities.) However, in almost every site, school administrators and program staff, among others, stated that the Serve-America program had resulted in an improved image for the school and, in a number of cases, positive reports on the school in the media. In half of the sites, the program also resulted in a set of new relationships between the schools and local agencies that had served as service sites, with the potential for those relationships to continue and grow (see Exhibit 6.2). In general, where new relationships or an improved image did not result, it was in those sites where the service was limited in scope or where the service program was only marginally linked to a specific school.

While these results are generally positive, it is easy to overstate their overall impact. In most cases, the reality is that new relationships were built between individual teachers or administrators and community agencies as a result of those programs: relationships that offer the

Exhibit 6.2
IMPACTS ON SCHOOL/COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS

Site	Improved Image of School in Community	Resulted in New Relationships in Community	Comments
Campus Middle School	Yes	No	While the program has initiated contact with multiple agencies, the relationship is still seen as one-way. No increased agency involvement in the school.
Redlands Middle School	Yes	Yes	Service program has generated interest and involvement by agencies in the community. "We don't need to solicit agency involvement anymore. They are calling us wanting to be involved."
Springfield	No	No	At Forest Park, limited community contact in service projects.
Centennial	Yes	Yes	"Marked improvement" in relationship between school and surrounding neighborhood. School and neighborhood association now applying for joint grants to continue service activities.
Fall River	No	No	Out-of-school program: no links to any Fall River Schools.
Medway	Yes	Yes	Positive news coverage; has become easier to recruit agencies for service.
North Olmsted	Yes	Yes	Program has generated substantial positive press and feedback from the community. Senior Fest and other projects credited with creating positive image of school in community, passage of school bond issue.
Toledo	Yes	No	Program has generated positive media attention for Libbey High School. However, has not established new relationships.
Lancaster	Yes	Yes	Has improved image of school and youth in community: "There is a negative perception associated with youth. This program has been an eye opener for the community and it highlights the super kids. It gives kids a positive image."
Britten's Neck	Yes	No	Generated positive feedback on the new park and appreciation for school's efforts. However, no new partners.

potential for new types of school/community interaction. However, in only a few sites—most notably Centennial High School, Redlands Middle School, and possibly North Olmsted High School—did the community service program come to be perceived as a defining feature of the school or widely recognized within the community as a whole. What service has provided to date is a step out from the school to the community, but it is only an initial step and often one without a broader institutional backing.

It is important to note that in several instances, community agencies were the lead organization operating the local Serve-America program. While these agencies were not expected to have the same institutional agenda as public schools, they also found that Serve-America helped to foster new institutional relationships and services to the community.

- The SWIC program has been able to significantly expand its afterschool program and establish a regular service component, including the addition of a part-time service coordinator, as the result of its Serve-America grants. The program (particularly the "graffiti busters") has also helped to build new relationships with local business owners and residents.

- The Magic Makers program, though formally school-based, has demonstrated the capacity of the Girl Scouts to provide services for older, inner-city girls, a population generally outside the Girl Scout mainstream. In doing so, the program has also given Girl Scouts new credibility in the community: "It has opened doors for us—we are ***not*** just a white middle class organization."

- In Fall River, while the program was not refunded, both the Citizen's organization and the Fall River Public Housing Authority, two of the core partners, have gained experience in providing youth programming and a set of projects to add to their repertoire in working with the community. Similarly, Teenline staff note that their Serve-America experience has provided a service curriculum that their organization expects to integrate into other work with the public schools.

6.3 Summary and Conclusions

The relatively short timeframe of this evaluation and the relative youth of the Serve-America initiative make it difficult to reach any firm conclusions regarding the ultimate institutional impacts of the program. However, there are a number of positive indications at this early date that Serve-America has begun to meet its institutional goals. The programs that were established under Serve-America do represent the creation of new service opportunities and appear surprisingly resilient. Community service programs have also brought participating

schools considerable positive attention and helped establish new relationships in the community. Given the small amount of the Serve-America grants and short time available for program development, these represent significant accomplishments.

At the same time, it is important to recognize that while there have been some important successes in introducing and institutionalizing service in public schools, the degree of lasting institutional change brought by the Serve-America grants has been limited to date. Community service remains largely the province of individual teachers or coordinators in most schools rather than a well-backed institutional agenda. Training and in-service education on service learning is rare, and there are few mechanisms in place for replicating the work of the initial site to other classrooms or schools in the district. While it is too soon to expect major institutional impacts, it does seem clear that a more deliberate and proactive effort to build service-learning into the school structure is needed if the goal is to fully integrate service into instructional practice.

CHAPTER SEVEN
IMPACTS ON THE COMMUNITY

What are the benefits to the community from the Serve-America program? While the emphasis in the literature on programs for school-aged youth is on participant and institutional development, the community benefits from the Serve-America programs were, in fact, very substantial. In the high school programs in particular, students have taken on serious responsibilities and produced work of lasting value in the community. In general the work of the program participants was rated highly by host agencies (i.e, the agencies where the service was performed) and by the beneficiaries of the service. The total value of the service, as estimated by the service sites, was also substantial.

This chapter provides an overview of the community impacts of the Serve-America programs in the intensive study sites. It provides a sampling of the kinds of specific project accomplishments reported by the programs as well as information on the quality and estimated value of the service performed.

7.1 COMMUNITY IMPACTS METHODOLOGY

In order to assess community impacts, the evaluation drew on three major sources: on-site interviews and site visits to selected host agencies where program participants performed their service; structured telephone interviews with staff representatives at 71 host agencies in the intensive study sites, and a brief postcard survey of service beneficiaries.

The most systematic of the data collection activities was the telephone survey of host agency representatives. Each of the intensive study sites was asked for listings of agencies where program participants had performed service during the 1993-94 school year and for contact information for each agency. Ultimately, 10 of the intensive study sites were able to provide contact information for 95 schools, community agencies, city departments, and other nonprofit organizations. Interviews were completed with 71 of those agencies (75 percent); in the balance of the sites, either the organization could not be contacted (some, such as the park rangers, were largely unavailable by telephone) or the individual who had supervised the project no longer worked at the agency.

Host agency interviews collected data on four broad community impact-related issues: project accomplishments, estimated value of the service performed, the impact of the work (in terms of whether the work would have been completed without the volunteers), and the quality of the work performed.

In addition, as part of the host agency survey, agencies were asked to indicate whether their projects involved identifiable beneficiaries who could be surveyed. In those instances where beneficiaries could be identified, a brief, postcard-sized beneficiary survey was distributed, which asked for beneficiary assessments of the services performed. Approximately 290 surveys were distributed and 90 were completed and returned.[1]

Finally, every site visit included interviews with host agency representatives. The interviews gathered information on the nature of the work, service quality, assessments of the impact of the volunteers on the agency as an institution, and estimates of the broader impacts of the service program on the agency and the community. As with the assessments of participant and institutional impacts, these assessments were used to place the quantitative data in perspective and to gather information on the range of benefits that could not be readily quantified.

7.2 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Based on the project accomplishments listings generated by the telephone surveys and on-site interviews with host agency staff, it is clear that the participants in the Serve-America projects provided substantial and significant services to their communities. In the high school programs in particular (but also in many middle school projects), participants took on

1. It is important to emphasize that this "customer satisfaction" survey of beneficiaries was not designed as a random sample, but can instead be characterized as a "convenience sample" reflecting the availability of appropriate respondents. In general, surveys of service beneficiaries present a challenge because of the difficulties in identifying or communicating with beneficiaries, or of beneficiaries recognizing the source of their services. Clearly, some beneficiaries are easier to survey than others. Homeless people who receive services from program participants or patients in the local hospital are somewhat difficult to survey because of their transience. Young children who play in a new playground built by program participants, who are in day care, or who participate in afterschool activities are also difficult to survey. People who are more stable, such as nursing home patients who receive care from participants or low-income housing residents whose homes are repainted, are much easier to locate and survey. Similarly, in larger institutions (hospitals, museums, parks, etc.) it was often difficult to distinguish volunteers from staff, or program participants from other volunteers. The common issue in all these instances is the difficulty of gaining assessments from a wide range of service recipients.

responsibility for major projects, performed a well-defined set of functions within organizations, or provided services (such as tutoring) on a consistent basis over an extended period of time.

Appendix G includes brief descriptions of approximately 50 projects reported through the host agencies surveys, grouped into four major categories: human needs, education, environment, and public safety. Those projects represent an estimated 40,000 hours of service.[2]

As the listing in the Appendix indicates, the projects ranged widely, from park construction to face painting at neighborhood fairs, to working one-on-one with Alzheimer's patients or severely retarded children. Some examples include the following:

- At Britten's Neck High School, students in the Agricultural Science program helped to construct the small rural community's only park, which included walking paths, playground areas, and ball fields. The park became a regular walking area for community elderly, the home for the town little league, and the site for community events. "People drive fifteen miles from other rural communities just to use the park."

- In two of the intensive study site communities, students worked as aides in schools for children with severe developmental disabilities. In one, the students helped children in the pool, wrapped gifts for the Christmas party, and helped organize the local Special Olympics. In the other site, students provided one-on-one support six hours a week, working as teacher aides and personal care attendants for children with moderate to severe retardation.

- In numerous sites, students worked as teacher's aides and tutors for adults and children. In one site, students worked four nights a week as tutors for adults in an English as a Second Language program. Others worked as teachers' aides in middle and elementary schools and special education programs.

- At one middle school, students spent at least an hour a day for nine weeks helping to promote a concert to benefit a theater restoration project. They made and distributed posters, made their own public service announcements for local television and radio stations, and worked at the event itself.

- At another middle school, students spent a semester learning CPR and medical emergency treatments as part of their science curriculum. One student later saved her mother's life with the Heimlich maneuver, which she learned in the class.

---

2. Hours of service are based on hours reported through the host agency telephone survey. Direct service hours as reported on the Participation and Status Reports from the sites (which includes projects that did not respond to the survey) total 61,883.

- In Lancaster and North Olmsted, students provided staff support at local public agencies. In North Olmsted, students helped to run the food bank, coordinated public transportation for disabled elderly, and organized the public Christmas lighting and Arbor Day programs for the city. In Lancaster, students helped to upgrade the computer information systems at the public library, provided administrative support for the local Fire Chief, and answered calls to the city's police department.

While the service projects clearly varied in significance and import, the majority appear to have represented real work that needed to be done. In many cases, according to the host agency representatives interviewed on site and over the telephone, the service time provided by participants represented the difference between work getting done and not getting done or between minimal services and improved service quality for service recipients. When asked whether some, all, or none of the work would have been completed without the help of program participants, host agency staff indicated that in 27 percent of the projects, *none* of the work would have taken place without the help of program participants. For another 41 percent of the projects, staff indicated that only "some of the work" would have happened in the absence of the program. Among the high school sites in particular, host agency staff estimated that over 75 percent of the projects would not have been completed without the service participants (Exhibit 7.1).

Exhibit 7.1
SPONSOR'S ASSESSMENT OF THE INTENSIVE STUDY SITE PROGRAMS' IMPACT ON SERVICE PROJECTS PERFORMED[a]

Sponsor's Assessment of Whether Work Would Have Been Completed Without Program	Percentage of Service Projects		
	Middle School	High School	Total
None of the Work	33%	24%	27%
Some of the Work	11%	52%	41%
All of the Work	56%	24%	32%

Source: Value of Output Survey, unweighted N=68.

[a] Host agency staff were asked: "Would this work have gotten done without the services of the participant(s)?"

years. "We see this as a partnership—a give and take. We take students to get things done, but also because we want to help the student. The kids become part of the family."

7.4 INDIRECT BENEFITS

Beyond the direct delivery of services, program staff, school administrators, and the host agencies also pointed to examples of less tangible, but often significant indirect benefits from the local Serve-America projects. In Chapter 6, for example, it was noted that, in several communities the Serve-America programs helped to establish new relationships between schools and community organizations, opening the door for future collaborations.

Two other broad types of indirect benefits were also commonly noted by individuals involved in the intensive study site programs. The first of these was an improvement in community attitudes towards youth and the schools, in some cases resulting in increased support for the schools in the community.

- In North Olmsted, the annual Senior Fest, a dance and festival for senior citizens organized by the SITES program became a widely recognized community event. The organization of the event by students, and the interactions between students and seniors at the festival were credited by a number of observers with having improved the attitudes of community seniors towards the schools and with having generated support in the community for the school budget.[3]

- In Fort Collins, the physical improvement of the school grounds has helped improve the relationship with the neighbors. "The school was at arm's length, now the school is part of the community."

In other communities, school officials and host agency staff also noted the effect on community attitudes:

> *There is a negative perception associated with youth. This program has been an eye opener for the community and it highlights super kids. It gives the kids a positive image.* (School Administrator)

> *[A student who had been working at an elderly housing complex noted:] Older people don't always want to support schools because they think they have already done that. They see us and meet us, and they want to help again.*

3. It is probably no coincidence that the 1995 Senior Fest was scheduled to take place several weeks before a public vote on school financing in the community.

(weighted by service hours) rated the program as "good" and 70 percent as "excellent." Finally, when agencies were asked whether they would work with the program again, 98 percent of the host sites answered positively.

Exhibit 7.2
Host Agency Assessments of Work Quality, by Service Area, Intensive Sites[a]

Average rating on 10-point scale, all projects:	9.7
Percent rating overall program quality:	
Excellent	70.0%
Good	26.0
Fair	4.0
Poor	0.0
Agency would work with program again	98.4%

Source: Interviews with host agencies in the intensive evaluation sites for projects active from July 1, 1993 to May 31, 1994. Sample size: 70 projects

[a] Projects weighted by participant hours.

Beneficiary assessments of service quality in the Serve-America programs were also high, though the relatively selective nature of the sample (i.e., those beneficiaries who could be identified and were willing and able to respond) makes it necessary to treat the results with caution. Beneficiaries were asked two questions on the postcard surveys: how they would rate the quality of the services provided by the student volunteers, and how much of a difference the service provided had made in the quality of the beneficiary's life. In both instances, the results were largely positive. 74 percent of the service recipients rated the quality of students' work as "very good" or "excellent" in the surveys, and a similar figure (78 percent) indicated that the service had "greatly increased" the quality of life or resulted in "some improvement."

What comes through clearly in the conversations on the telephone surveys and the on-site interviews is the general level of enthusiasm and support felt by the host agencies for the Serve-America projects. Agency staff regularly expressed their appreciation for the participants' contribution and their appreciation of the importance of the service learning process. In the words of one city official whose office had been largely staffed by students for the past two

Comments from staff at the service sites during the site visits confirm and extend the survey results. In most cases, staff saw the students as adding needed capacity and, in doing so, improving the quality of service:

> *We noticed that Alzheimer patients are responsive to the young people. It has been a learning process to mix both the generations and to see what they learn from one another. We notice that the Alzheimer patients light up, sparkle, they enjoy it. This has enabled us to have a one-to-one ratio—if we had to pay someone to come in, it would be very expensive.* (Alzheimer Respite Program)

> *This has been very positive—the students became part of the staff. My staff are fighting to get these kids. They give us the capacity to do one-on-one teaching instead of just small group.* (Special Education Center)

> *The students are great. Our staff just get burned out, having the kids helps out. [Without the students], it would make my job twice as hard. The program is so much better, much better rounded with the students.* (Adult Day Care Program)

> *Every extra pair of hands is a few minutes extra per child—it makes a difference. That extra personal attention that kids get is important—especially for kids who may be in day care. Its a hard world out there for these kids.* (Kindergarten Program)

> *[At the Day Care Center], the volunteers come at the end of the day. That part of the day is the most taxing—its hard. When we have a good group come in and play with the kids, it is a breath of fresh air, moods lift. It has a real impact.* (Day Care Center)

> *It is also important to have the older and younger kids interact. Little kids need to see older kids doing something positive. They need that role modeling. It also helps our teachers to get a sense of what happens to kids when they grow up; it helps give them a sense that what they are doing can have a positive impact.* (Day Care Center)

> *[The community park] is the only place for a family to come together. They keep it peaceful. Tiny tots to elderly, people can come here and enjoy themselves.* (Citizen)

7.3 Assessing Service Quality

As the quotations from the service sites would suggest, most of the host agencies contacted rated both the quality of the work and the service program as a whole quite highly. On the telephone survey, host agencies were asked to rate the quality of the work done by participants on a 10 point scale, with 1 indicating "unacceptable" and 10 "the best possible." The average rating across all projects was a 9.7 (see Exhibit 7.2). Host agencies were also asked to rate the job done for them by the program as a whole. 26 percent of the responses

The other major benefit, from the point of view of the host agencies, was in educating a new generation of citizens so that they would better understand the needs of the community and its residents. For many of the host agencies, one of the reasons they participated was not only to improve service now, but to create a more aware constituency for the future:

> *One of our goals is to educate and increase the sensitivity of the community. Young people get a good understanding of mental retardation and a positive image of what the program here does—they become advocates for the program.*
>
> *One of our major goals is to encourage interaction between generations, for kids to learn about elderly, and vice versa. Before [the program], elders didn't like kids, didn't support school issues. That has changed. At the same time, kids attitudes towards the elderly have changed. The real issue is that age groups are separating. We need to rebuild consideration and caring.*
>
> *We like to have the kids come. The clients like seeing young people, and it eases the workload. But we also want people to be aware of the mission and homeless issues.* [Homeless Shelter]

Beyond these broad categories, each community had stories about indirect or unanticipated effects of the community service programs. In one community, three of the agencies serving as host sites won grants for new programs, in part as a result of their use of student volunteers. In another, an elderly citizen that students worked with decided to give funds for a scholarship at the high school. As noted in the discussion of institutional impacts, the degree to which these broader community benefits were evident depended in large part on the nature and visibility of the program itself (an event like the Senior Fest garners substantially more attention than an individual student working in a nursing home), and it is easy to overstate the actual impact. But what was strikingly clear in all the sites was the degree to which the Serve-America programs were seen as contributing and the extent both schools and community agencies saw service as an investment in building a more understanding and collaborative community.

7.5 Value of Program Output

The final element in examining community impacts was the construction of an estimate for the value of the direct services performed by the Serve-America participants. In many ways, this was one of the most challenging aspects of the evaluation because of the variety of service

Exhibit 7.3
VALUE OF PROGRAM OUTPUT PER SERVICE HOUR, INTENSIVE STUDY SITES[a]

Hourly value of:	
Participant labor[b]	$5.81
Fringe benefits[c]	1.57
Supervision	.00
Materials and supplies[d]	.02
Administration and overhead[e]	1.48
Nonparticipant volunteer labor[f]	1.06
Total value per hour	9.94

Source: Interviews with host agencies in the intensive evaluation sites for projects active from July 1, 1993 to May 31, 1994. Sample size: 65 projects

[a] This estimate is based upon project host agencies' estimates of the cost of completing the project with regular labor.

[b] Host agencies reported the wage of regular employees who had the same kind of responsibilities as the participants. Host agencies with no comparable employees were asked what it would cost to hire someone at the participants' level of quality and productivity. Host agencies with regular employees who had the same kind of responsibilities as the participants were asked to compare those employees and the participants in terms of productivity. If the participants were more or less productive than the employees, then the host agency was asked to express that difference as a percentage of a regular worker's productivity. That percentage is applied here as an adjustment to the participants' wages. For example, if participants were 70 percent as productive as regular workers, then the reported wage was multiplied by .70 to adjust for the lower productivity of participants. An analogous adjustment was made in instances where the host agency stated that the participants were more productive than regular workers. This adjustment is presented here as a dollar amount, across all participants.

[c] The legally required benefits (i.e., social security, workers' compensation, and unemployment insurance) are added to all participant wages. The additional benefits are added to participants' wages only for projects where the host agency reported that regular employees who had the same kind of responsibilities received those benefits.

[d] This amount includes only supplies and equipment provided directly by the program to perform the service project (such as tools and raw construction materials), and does not include any materials donated by the host agency or by other organizations or individuals.

[e] This amount represents 20 percent of the participants' wages and benefits. The figure is based on the overhead rates reported by temporary help agencies, which provide similar recruitment, training, and placement functions.

[f] The value of a nonparticipant volunteer hour is assumed to be minimum wage ($4.25), with no benefits.

7.6 SUMMARY

For the most part, studies of community service for school-aged youth focus on the participant and, to a lesser extent, institutional benefits of service. This emphasis is appropriate, given the participant-oriented nature of service and service learning for young people. In this context, the data on the community benefits of Serve-America are striking. Despite the relatively young age of the participants, Serve-America programs produced an array of tangible benefits to the community through the work of their participants. While some of the enthusiasm of those involved in the programs may need to be taken with a grain of salt (who, after all, wants to say negative things about youthful volunteers), it is clear that the work of these volunteers does represent an important addition to the community. As the next section demonstrates, the contribution is such that it represents a net benefit to the community even after the costs of program operation are taken into consideration.

CHAPTER EIGHT
COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF SERVE-AMERICA

The preceding chapters have outlined a variety of impacts of the Serve-America programs in the intensive study sites, including impacts on participant attitudes and behaviors, the establishment of new service opportunities in schools and community organizations, and the delivery of services or the accomplishment of specific projects of benefit to the community. The final question in the evaluation of the impacts of Serve-America is how these impacts compare to the costs of operating Serve-America programs. What is the cost of delivering these benefits, and to what extent can the costs and benefits be compared?

8.1 METHODOLOGY

To address these questions, the national evaluation prepared a cost-effectiveness analysis for the programs in the intensive study sites. In a cost-effectiveness approach, program costs are compared to a combination of monetary and non-monetary benefits to establish the relative cost of a specific set of outcomes. A cost-effectiveness approach differs from a full cost-benefit analysis in its recognition that it may not be possible to measure all the program benefits in financial terms. Consequently, while the cost side of the equation is generally stated in dollar terms, the benefits are often defined in a mix of monetary and non-monetary measures. In the health care community, for example, a cost-effectiveness analysis might be used to measure the cost of a projected reduction in deaths from a targeted disease without making an effort to attach a dollar value to that result.[1]

For the Serve-America evaluation, the cost-effectiveness analysis incorporates three basic kinds of information. First, the evaluation staff collected information from the intensive study sites on the program expenditures for the 1993-94 program year covered by the evaluation. Those program expenditures included the grants from the Commission on National and Community Service, plus other federal and local matching funds. Those total expenditures were then divided by the number of program participants reported by the sites on the Participation and

1. See Donald Shepard and Mark Thompson, "First Principles of Cost-Effectiveness Analysis in Health," *Public Health Reports*, 94,6 (December 1979), 535-543.

Service Reports to establish a program cost per participant. That figure represents the cost side of the cost-effectiveness equation.[2]

On the benefit side, the only benefits that could be measured in monetary terms were the value of output estimates developed as part of the evaluation of community impacts (see Chapter Seven). For the purposes of the cost-effectiveness analysis, the average value of output per service hour of $9.94 was multiplied by the average hours of direct service per participant in the intensive study sites to establish the average value of output per participant. This figure represents the defined monetary benefits for the Serve-America programs.

Finally, the cost-effectiveness analysis includes the non-monetary benefits that have been identified through the evaluation study. As the preceding chapters have discussed, these benefits include a mix of participant impacts, institutional impacts, and indirect benefits to the community in the form of changes in attitudes, new partnerships, etc.

8.2 FINDINGS

Exhibit 8.1 contains our estimates of these benefits and costs. The top panel of the exhibit shows estimated monetary benefits and costs per participant; benefits are shown as positive numbers, costs as negative numbers. Monetary benefits minus monetary costs are the estimated net monetary benefit of the program. The bottom panel of the exhibit indicates whether the non-monetary impacts were positive (+), negative (-), or zero (0). The exhibit shows benefits and costs from each of three perspectives: participants (column 1), the rest of the community (column 2), and society as a whole (column 3). Benefits and costs to society as a whole are the sum of benefits and costs to participants plus benefits and costs to the rest of the community.

In purely monetary terms, Serve-America programs represent an extremely cost-effective investment of public funds. On average, programs in the intensive evaluation sites produced over $3.00 in direct community benefits for every $1.00 in program costs. This figure does not include the value of participant impacts and indirect/non-monetary benefits to the community, which were the primary targets of Serve-America and would represent additional returns on the investment.

---

2. We include all costs, not just the CNCS grant, because the measured benefits reflect all the resources devoted to the program.

Exhibit 8.1
ANNUAL PROGRAM BENEFITS AND COSTS PER PARTICIPANT

Type of Cost or Benefit	Benefit (+) or Cost (-) to:		
	Participants	Community	Society
Monetary Costs and Benefits:			
Total operational costs of program	0	-160.09	-160.09
CNCS Costs	0	-89.12	-89.12
Non-CNCS (Matching) Costs	0	-70.96	-70.96
Value of program output	0	+492.30	+492.30
Net monetary benefits:	0	+332.21	+332.21
Nonmonetary Benefits:			
Impacts on participant civic and social development[a]	+	+	+
Improved school attendance	+	+	+
Improved academic achievement	0	0	0
Reduced risk behavior	0	0	0
Increased likelihood of post-program community service[b]	+	+	+
Indirect benefits to community		(c)	(c)

Source: National reporting forms, interviews with host agency staff, and expenditure data provided by program staff (intensive evaluation sites). Only those sites for which both expenditure data and data on participants and service hours were available were included in the calculations.

[a] Statistically significant impacts at the high school level only.
[b] Based on self-reported likelihood of future service. Effects on actual post-program community service not estimated.
[c] Not measured.

CHAPTER NINE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION: IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY AND RESEARCH

At the time of this evaluation, the Serve-America program was entering into its second year of operation under the 1990 National and Community Service Act. At the national and local levels, educators and program practitioners involved in Serve-America were very much in the midst of a process of translating a widely scattered service "movement" into a national network of federally funded service and service-learning programs. The vast majority of local programs funded under the legislation were new and still learning how best to organize and manage their initiatives.

9.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In that context, the findings from the Serve-America evaluation are surprisingly positive. While supporters of Serve-America may have hoped for a broader set of participant impacts or clearer indications that educational reform was taking place, the fact is that relatively few programs evaluated this early in their lifespan or over this brief a period of time produce positive results, and fewer still when an effort is made to evaluate a representative sample of programs rather than a set of exemplary examples.

For Serve-America, in contrast, impacts were evident in a number of different areas. To briefly summarize:

- ***Serve-America has been widely implemented and is affecting large numbers of youth across the country.*** Approximately 434,000 school-aged youth and 90,000 nonparticipant volunteers participated in Serve-America programs during the 1993-94 program year. Participants provided approximately 4.7 million hours of direct service; nonparticipant volunteers contributed another 1.2 million hours of service.

- ***Serve-America participants represent a diverse group of young people.*** Participants ranged in grade from kindergarten through high school. They were relatively evenly split between males and females (48 percent and 52 percent) and were racially and ethnically diverse: 65 percent of the participants were white and 28 percent were African-American or Hispanic. Twenty-one percent were economically disadvantaged.

- ***Serve-America has had a positive impact on participants in terms of civic and social attitudes, involvement in service, and school-related behaviors.*** Among the high school programs, the evaluation found significant positive impacts on seven outcomes:

  - school attendance
  - personal and social responsibility
  - involvement in volunteer service
  - hours of volunteer service
  - likelihood of future service
  - communications skills, and
  - work orientation

Among the middle school programs, the evaluation found significant positive impacts on three measures:

- school attendance
- hours of homework
- hours of volunteer service.

- ***Eighty-five percent of the high school participants and 66 percent of the middle school students indicated that they had learned a skill that would be useful in the future.*** A substantial percentage of the high school students (71 percent) also indicated that they had learned more through their service than through a typical class at school.

- ***Ninety-six percent of the high school participants and over 75 percent of the middle school youth indicated that they believed the services they performed were helpful to the community and the individuals served.***

- ***In accordance with the basic goals of the Act, new service opportunities were created in 12 of the 13 intensive study sites.*** These programs appear likely to survive after the Serve-America funding ends, at least in the short term. Given the relatively small size of the initial grants and the short gestation period for these programs, this is a significant accomplishment.

- ***Serve-America programs provided services that were highly valued by the community.*** The quality of the work performed and the program overall were rated highly by the host agencies where work was performed: on average, the quality of the work was rated as 9.7 out of 10. Similarly, 96 percent of the host agencies rated overall program quality as "good" or "excellent" and 94 percent said they would sponsor participants again.

- ***Participants were performing services that would not have been available otherwise.*** In 68 percent of the projects, none or only some of the work would have been performed without the participants.

- ***Serve-America programs represent an extremely cost-effective investment of public funds.*** On average, programs in the intensive study sites produced about $3 in direct community benefits for every dollar in program costs. This figure does not include the value of participant impacts and indirect benefits to the community (e.g. new partnerships, changes in community attitudes, support for youth, etc.).

9.2 Issues for Research and Policy Development

While generally positive, the Serve-America results do raise several issues with longer-term research and policy implications for the field. The first of these is the need to examine the middle school experience more closely to determine whether the relative absence of participant impacts is a result of measurement problems, inappropriate expectations for the intervention, or weaknesses in the middle school programs themselves. To a larger degree than is the case with the programs for high school-aged youth, middle school programs are designed to infuse service-learning into the overall educational process rather than create a separate, stand-alone program experience. The benefit in this approach, educators would argue, is that service-learning becomes another tool in the instructional arsenal and can be used to reinforce a wide array of educational outcomes. At the same time, because middle school service-learning is supplementary and complementary to the broader educational experience, it is much more difficult to isolate and track program-related outcomes.

In considering the participant impacts in middle school programs, future research needs to examine several possibilities. One possibility is that the middle school programs are having more of an impact than indicated in this study, but that this research did not examine appropriate indicators or that the indicators were not sensitive enough to register change.

A second possibility is that the impacts of service-learning on younger students may only emerge over time and as the result of an accumulation of service-learning experiences. This argument recognizes that younger and older students are at different developmental stages and that impacts on values and attitudes may only become evident over the longer term. In this instance, a longer-term longitudinal study is necessary to determine actual impacts.

The third possibility is that the middle school programs themselves need to be strengthened through increased technical assistance and in-service training for teachers on the uses of service-learning. It is possible that as service-learning curricula and practice are further

developed and disseminated, that programs for students at all age levels will show increased impacts.

The question of longer term and cumulative impacts applies to high school as well as middle school programs. A second area for research, then, is the broader question of the longer-term impact of service on participants. There are a number of participant impact questions that this study cannot answer because of the time constraints of the study. One is the degree to which service impacts are ***cumulative***. As suggested above, for middle school students in particular, to what degree is it likely that a succession of small service experiences, year after year, will produce a significant impact? While there are few impacts evident on a year-by-year basis, would the results look different if we followed a group of middle school students over a longer period of time? Similarly, we do not know whether the impacts that were found, particularly in the high school programs, will ***persist*** over time. Do high school students continue to serve after their program ends? Does improved attendance translate into higher graduation rates? Given the nature of community service for school-aged youth, these are both important questions. Both, however, require a longer-term study to be satisfactorily answered.

A third issue is the need to examine the question of academic impacts more closely. As noted in Chapter 5, this study found an impact on school attendance, but not on academic performance or measures of school engagement. The question here is whether this reflects limitations in the programs studied or in the available measures. As with the middle school impacts, one possibility is that the measures used (for example, grade point average) are simply too crude to reflect incremental changes in student skills. The major strength of grade point average lies in its ready availability. However, it may be that more direct measures might better capture improvements in knowledge and skills.[1]

A fourth issue is the degree to which institutional impacts can be strengthened through either further refinement of national policy or strengthening of technical assistance efforts for grantees and program operators in this area. On the one hand, it is clear that institutionalization of any educational innovation is a slow process that involves successfully piloting the new

1. It is worth noting that many of the academic benefits thought to accrue from service-learning involve improvements in critical thinking and problem-solving skills. While there is tremendous interest in this among educators and policy makers, effective tools for assessing these skills are not yet available. Corporation staff have begun to work with state education assessment groups on these issues, but this may represent an area where more intensive research and development work may be appropriate.

methods, disseminating information, building support for change, and providing training for teachers and administrators. But the experience of the intensive sites suggests that, to the degree that institutional change is a significant goal for the national community service program, the institutional change process needs to be more systematically addressed. At the very least, we would recommend that the Corporation make the question of institutional change a more explicit element in the application process at the federal and state level, and that at least a portion of the technical assistance provided to the field (through conferences, the Serve-America Clearinghouse, and other sources) be directed toward helping school administrators, teachers, and program staff think about the steps necessary to broaden the use of service-learning in their districts.

Finally, one of the more significant findings of the evaluation was the fact that while program ***type*** showed little direct relationship with impact, the ***quality of the program experience***—in terms of the nature of the work, the degree of independent decision-making involved, opportunities for discussion with teachers and peers, etc.—was directly related to the likelihood of a positive impact on participants. Though by no means surprising, this finding highlights the critical importance of program ***implementation*** and reinforces the need to make a regular investment in training and development for local practitioners. To the extent that Serve-America (and Learn and Serve K-12) succeed in their mission of expanding the use of service-learning beyond the committed core of experienced practitioners, the need to make a significant investment in training and development is likely to grow in importance.

APPENDIX A

OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL EVALUATION

The national Serve-America evaluation is part of a three-year effort to both describe and assess the impacts of the programs funded under the 1990 National and Community Service Act. In 1992, the Commission on National and Community Serve contracted with Abt Associates and Brandeis University's Center for Human Resources through a competitive process to conduct the evaluation, with three basic goals:

1. To provide an accurate and comprehensive description of the programs, participants, and service activities funded under the 1990 National and Community Service Act by the Commission;

2. To evaluate the effectiveness of the Commission-funded programs, in terms of their impacts on participants and on the schools and community-based agencies that operated the programs, and in terms of the impact of the services they delivered to the community; and

3. To identify (where possible) the relative effectiveness of different approaches to community service and the "best practices" that support effective programs.

The Commission outlined a set of nine questions to guide the evaluation and has worked closely with the evaluators in implementing the evaluation design.[1] The original evaluation design and the various data collection instruments developed for the evaluation were also reviewed by a series of practitioner "sounding boards" established by the Commission to help guide the evaluation process and by a panel of evaluation experts selected by the Commission.

A.1 THE EVALUATION INFORMATION SYSTEM

The evaluation itself was comprised of two major sets of activities. The first was the establishment of a national data reporting system, the Evaluation Information System (EIS). The

[1]The nine specific questions posed by the Commission at the beginning of the evaluation are:

1. What are the essential characteristics of the program?
2. What are the essential characteristics of the participants?
3. What types of service activities are participants engaged in?
4. (a) How many hours of service are provided by participants, and (b) are these incremental additions of service to the community?
5. Why do participants join the program?
6. Does the program make a difference in the lives of participants?
7. Does the program make a difference in the community?
8. Is the program cost-effective?
9. What program characteristics lead to the accomplishment of Act and Commission objectives?

EIS was designed to collect basic descriptive information on program characteristics, numbers and characteristics of participants, service hours, and program accomplishments as a means of providing an overall description of the Commission-funded programs as a whole. For the Serve-America program, the major elements of the EIS system were a ***Project Description Form*** to be completed at the beginning of the program cycle, which provided information on such basic program characteristics as program type, scope, format and projected service activities; and the ***Participation and Status Report***, which collected aggregate information from each program on a semester basis on numbers of participants, participant characteristics, and service hours. The first national data were collected retrospectively at the end of the 1992-93 program year and were presented in the evaluation report, *Serving America: The First Year of Programs Funded by the Commission on National and Community Service*. Data for the 1993-94 program year were collected beginning in July, 1993, and are discussed in Chapter Two of this report.

A.2 Intensive Study Site Evaluation

The second major component of the evaluation took the form of a series of impact studies that were conducted in a smaller group of intensive study sites, focusing on the 1993-94 program year. The purpose of those studies was to evaluate the participant, institutional, and community impacts of the local community service programs, to assess the cost-effectiveness of service, and to identify implementation issues and lessons affecting program effectiveness.

For the Serve-America program, the major elements of the intensive site studies were as follows:

- **Participant Impacts**. In order to examine impacts on participant community service involvement, attitudes, academic performance, and involvement in risk behaviors, the Serve-America evaluation used a combination of participant and comparison group surveys, school records, and on-site interviews with program participants. The evaluation conducted pre- and post-program surveys of participants and of a comparison group in each community. The surveys were designed to capture a broad range of information, including measures of personal and social responsibility, data on recent volunteer experience, and information on involvement in a variety of high-risk activities (drug and alcohol use, pregnancy and parenting, violence and gang activity, etc.). School record information was also collected for each group, including information on attendance, grades, course failures, and suspensions. The surveys and school records were then

supplemented with interviews with participants, their parents, teachers, and other program observers. Copies of the surveys are included in Appendix G.

As is discussed in more detail in Appendix C, the basic analytical approach used in evaluating this data was a comparison of the outcomes for participants and comparison group members after adjusting statistically for a variety of individual characteristics and for the baseline scores on each outcome. In effect, this approach compares the changes from pre- to post-program on each measure for the participant and comparison groups as a means of distinguishing program impacts from other changes (such as simple maturation) that might be occurring at the same time. While the use of a "quasi-experimental" comparison group design is somewhat less reliable than a pure "experimental" approach, in which participants and control group members are randomly selected from a common pool, the use of comparison groups does result in a substantially greater capacity to isolate program effects than the simple "pre-post" (non-comparison group) design that has been used in much of the community service research.[2]

- **Institutional Impacts**. The major source of information on institutional impacts was the series of on-site interviews and observations conducted over the course of the evaluation. Each site was visited four times over the course of the evaluation, generally for two days per visit. The first visits took place in May and June, 1993, to gather initial information about the programs and meet with local administrators involved in the evaluation. Two visits then took place during the 1993-94 school year, one in the late fall or early winter (depending on the program's schedule), and the second near the end of the academic year. A final set of interviews took place late in the first semester of the 1994-95 school year, to examine program implementation and institutional impacts in the period following the evaluation. Site visits included interviews with participating students, program staff, school administrators and teachers, parents, and selected service site representatives. While particularly critical to the analysis of institutional impacts, the on-site interviews were used to collect an array of information on all the major impact areas as well as information for the program analysis.

- **Community Impacts**. The two major sources of information on the community benefits from service were the on-site interviews and observations at selected community service sites and telephone interviews with representatives of host agencies at approximately 80 percent of the service sites across all of the intensive study sites. The telephone interviews in particular were used to gather

[2] As noted earlier, the research design did not include any post-program followup. In large part, this was the result of an early decision by the Commission to limit the resources required for the Serve-America evaluation. The decision to not conduct any followup studies was confirmed later in the study, in large part due to the passage of the 1993 National and Community Service Trust Act, which changed some elements of the Serve-America program and led to a Corporation decision to initiate a new round of evaluations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

information on the specific accomplishments of each program, on the perceived quality of the service, and on the estimated value of the service. In addition, brief postcard questionnaires were distributed by the programs to service beneficiaries to collect data on beneficiary perceptions of service quality and the impact of community service on their lives.

The evaluation also collected information fromr program staff on program expenditures for use in the cost-effectiveness analysis.

A.3 Selection of the Serve-America Intensive Study Sites

The evaluation of Serve-America programs took place in thirteen intensive study sites in four states: Colorado, Massachusetts, Ohio, and South Carolina.[3] The decision to group the sites in several states was made so that it would be possible to gain an initial understanding of the role of state-level activities in local implementation.

The site selection process took place in two stages. First, based on program descriptions provided by the states and coded by evaluation staff, an initial group of states was selected for inclusion in the evaluation. The major factors in the selection of the states were the presence of a mix of programs within each state (for example, in terms of a mix of middle and high school programs and a variety of program designs) and the representation of different regions in the country. Two of the states selected were also "leader states" that had received additional funds to provide technical assistance and other capacity-building services on a state and regional basis.

The second stage selected programs within each state to provide a representative mix of programs on several key indicators. Those indicators included:

- Program type (school, community-based, and adult volunteer programs);
- Program format (service course, integrated academic programs, and service only);
- School level (middle and high school);
- Scope (classroom, school-wide, district-wide, etc.); and

[3]Initially, fifteen sites were selected, and an additional five sites were to be added during the third year of the evaluation (in 1994-95). However, two of the sites dropped out early in the study (one decided that it did not have the resources to participate; the other decided not to continue its service program as a result of local budget cuts), and, subsequent to passage of the 1993 legislation (and the decision to fund a new round of evaluations), the Commission decided to limit the evaluation to the originally selected sites.

- Geographic location (urban, suburban, rural).

The selected programs were then contacted to solicit their interest in the evaluation and to confirm the often limited descriptive information that was available. All of the programs contacted expressed a willingness to participate in the evaluation.

Given the need to select intensive study sites well before national program information was available through the EIS, the goal of the evaluation was to find a reasonably representative mix of programs rather than a statistical probability sample. The numbers of programs that were selected within the various categories were chosen in accordance with the overall distribution of those program types among the universe of Commission-funded community service efforts, and no effort was made to identify or select programs that were considered "exemplary" or unusually effective. But it is important to recognize the limits of the selection process in interpreting the evaluation results. Though the site selection process was thoughtfully conducted, the information available for site selection was extremely limited at that early point in the Commission's operations and the selection process necessarily places some limits on the degree to which the results can be generalized.

The site selection process resulted in a group of sites that provided a varied mix of service learning and community service strategies. The thirteen intensive study sites included:

- Nine school-based, two community-based, and two adult volunteer/partnership programs;
- Five sites providing service experiences for middle school youth and seven programs for high school-aged participants (the adult volunteer program provided adult mentors for youth in grades K-12);
- Six programs that integrated community service into the mainstream academic curriculum, two freestanding service courses, and four out-of-school/service only programs; and
- Three district-wide efforts, four grade- or school-wide programs, and six that were focused on a single classroom, neighborhood, or target population.

Chapter Three of the report provides a more detailed description of the sites and their program activities.

APPENDIX B

RESEARCH AND POLICY BACKGROUND OF SERVE-AMERICA

The Serve-America program grew out of a long tradition of support and advocacy for community service and service learning for school-aged youth. As Dan Conrad and Diane Hedin point out in their review of the literature on school-based community service, there have been calls for the integration of community service into education since the 1920s, and "recommendations that service be part of the school experience ... have been a consistent, if less than dominant, feature of educational reports and reform proposals for the last 15 or 20 years."[1]

In broad terms, the arguments for community service have come from three different, though often overlapping, perspectives:

- **Civic Development**. The first of these, reflected in several of the goals in the national legislation, emphasizes service as a means of encouraging civic development or citizenship education. In this context, community service and service learning are seen as an effective (and perhaps necessary) means of "renewing the civic spirit" among American youth and of developing a more engaged, tolerant, and socially responsible generation of young people. Advocates of community service have argued that involvement in service can generate an increased sense of personal and social responsibility, an increased tolerance for and understanding of diversity, and a renewed commitment to contribute to the community through voluntarism.

- **Educational Development**. The second broad stream of support for community service and, in particular, service learning points to service learning as a means of more effectively engaging students in the educational process and of improving the quality of education generally. Service learning in this context is seen as providing a model for project-based and applied learning and for modeling instructional methods in which teachers function more as coaches and facilitators than front-of-the-room lecturers. Service learning, then, is viewed as a means of both improving instruction for young people, with attendant improvements in academic performance, and of beginning to shift the educational establishment as a whole toward reform.

- **Individual Development**. The third broad perspective on community service might best be described as focusing on the social and psychological development of youth as individuals. While encompassing both civic and educational goals, this perspective also points to service as a key developmental tool for young

[1] Dan Conrad and Diane Hedin, "School-Based Community Service: What We Know from Research and Theory," *Phi Delta Kappan* (June, 1991), 743-749.

people, providing an opportunity to reduce alienation and build self-esteem, gain a sense of personal responsibility, experience new and challenging social situations, etc. Building on this idea, service has become a central element in a number of youth programs aimed at reducing risk behaviors, including school failure and teenage parenting.

As background for the evaluation, and to place our findings in context, we reviewed a number of prior studies of school and community-based service learning programs. In general, these studies, and substantial anecdotal evidence, suggest that community service has the potential to have an impact on school-aged participants and institutions in all three areas: civic, educational, and personal development.[2] Conrad and Hedin's 1981 study of experiential education programs (one third of which were community service programs) found an increase in measures of moral development, personal and social responsibility, improved attitudes towards others, and self-acceptance.[3] Other studies have found that community service is associated with reduced likelihood of course failure and dropping out, improved reading grades, and improved quality of school life.[4] And the evaluation of the Teen Outreach Program, a teenage pregnancy prevention program that incorporates a heavy emphasis on community service, found that the program was effective in reducing teenage parenting.[5]

---

[2] Two valuable reviews of this literature are Conrad and Hedin's article in the *Phi Delta Kappan* on "School-Based Community Service," and a more recent review article, Cynthia W. Moore and Joseph P. Allen, "The Effects of Volunteering on the Young Volunteer," *Journal of Prevention* (in press). It is worth noting that there has been little if any formal research on the institutional and community impacts of community service. While there are a number of cost-benefit studies of service corps programs, our literature review failed to turn up a single study examining the costs and benefits or institutional impacts of community service programs for school-aged youth. Conrad and Hedin had a similar finding, noting that "In assessing the impact of service programs, researchers have mainly been concerned about the effect on the volunteer and have seldom taken into account what young people accomplish for others." (745)

[3] Dan Conrad and Diane Hedin, *Experiential Education Evaluation Project*, Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota, 1981.

[4] Studies finding improved academic performance and reduced school failure include a studies of the TOPS program and the Valued Youth Program. See S. Philliber, and J.P. Allen, "Life Options and Community Service: Teen Outreach Program," in B.C. Miller, *et al* (Eds.), *Preventing Adolescent Pregnancy: Model Programs and Evaluations* (Newbury Park: Sage, 1992); and J.A. Cardenas, R. Harris, M. Refugio Robledo, and J.D. Supik, JD. *Valued Youth Program: Dropout Prevention Strategies for At-Risk Students*, paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL, April, 1991. Also see R.L. Calabrese and H. Schumer, "The Effects of Service Activities on Adolescent Alienation, *Adolescence* 21 (83), 675-687.

[5] Philliber and Allen, "Life Options and Community Service: Teen Outreach Program."

At the same time, the studies of community service raise a number of cautions. As Moore and Allen note, the research designs vary widely among these studies, some relying on self-reported results, others lacking any comparison group, others relying on relatively small numbers of participants. In other instances, studies found little or no impact on key measures such as personal and social responsibility or that impacts varied among participants within the study.[6] Researchers warn that impacts are likely to be small in scale, given the limited nature of the intervention; that the likelihood of any particular impact seems to vary according to the nature of the service experience, the role of reflection, and the degree to which the program focuses attention on a particular result (for example, pregnancy prevention) as a primary program goal.[7]

When taken together, the various research studies and commission reports suggest two broad conclusions to be kept in mind in evaluating community service programs for school-age youth. The first is the tremendous ***variety*** of potential outcomes for community service and the lack of agreement on an ***single*** outcome as a widely accepted measure of program effectiveness. One of the implications for this evaluation was the need, therefore, to take a more exploratory approach to the evaluation of participant impacts, examining a broad group of impacts (ultimately, twenty-five different measures were examined) rather than focusing on a smaller group of central measures.

The second conclusion to be drawn is that even where impacts appear to exist, they are often small in scale and not easily captured. That this study does find a number of positive impacts on participants in community service programs is in many ways all the more striking

---

[6] For example, in one study, Fred Newman and Robert Rutter found that community service programs had some, but only small-scale, impacts on measures of social responsibility, in contrast to Conrad and Hedin's more strongly positive results (Newman and Rutter, "The Effects of High School Community Service Programs on Students' Social Development," Madison: Wisconsin Center for Educational Research, 1983). A second study of school-aged youth by Newman and Rutter found no impact on personal and social responsibility (Newman and Rutter, "The Potential of Community Service to Enhance Civic Responsibility," *Social Education* October, 1989, 371-374). Hamilton and Fenzel, using Conrad and Hedin's instruments, also found more limited impacts than Conrad and Hedin (S. Hamilton and L.M. Fenzel, "The Impact of Volunteer Experience on Adolescent Social Development: Evidence of Program Effects," *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 3,1 (1988) 65-80).

[7] It is worth noting, for example, that a number of the programs showing an impact on basic academic skills (for example, the Valued Youth Program) focus on tutoring as the primary service activity, so that much of the daily program activity is focused on basic skills development.

given the variations in results in previous studies and the relative rigor of this study's design. Conversely, the absence of impacts in several areas—most notably on risk behaviors such as teenage parenting or substance abuse—is less likely to reflect the failure of local programs than the fact that relatively few programs in the study targeted those outcomes specifically in their program design.

APPENDIX C

ANALYSIS SAMPLE AND IMPACT ESTIMATION METHOD

The impacts shown in Chapter Five were estimated using the analysis sample and methods specified in this appendix. The first section describes the analysis sample. Next we present the regression specifications used to estimate impacts and subgroup results. Finally, we outline adjustments made to the analysis sample through weighting and imputation.

C.1 ANALYSIS SAMPLE

In each of the intensive study sites, a comparison group of nonparticipants was selected for comparison with the participants. Through discussions with program staff and school officials, classes or afterschool clubs were identified that were similar to that site's participants in each site in terms of demographic background and academic achievement. In those sites with in-school programs, we identified a similar in-school course. To form comparison groups for the afterschool programs, we attempted to find a comparable group of students in another afterschool activity. Where possible, the comparison group for each site was drawn from the same school. In the three middle school sites, where all of the students in a grade or the school were involved in the program, the comparison group was drawn from students in another school in the same or a neighboring community. Self-administered surveys were given to both the program and comparison groups at the beginning and the end of the program year. Data on school performance, including grade point averages, attendance, and course failures, were collected on a separate roster completed by teachers.

The analysis of survey-based outcomes, such as scores on attitudinal scales, used only those sample members with both baseline and followup survey data. Of the twelve intensive study sites, three were dropped from the sample because it was not feasible to establish comparison groups. Participants from Centennial High School in Fort Collins, Colorado; the SWIC program in Denver; and Helpline/Teenline in Columbia, South Carolina, were deleted for this reason. We are left with nine sites totalling 497 observations in the final survey analysis sample; of these, 335 are in high school programs and 162 are in middle school programs. The

analysis sample for survey-based outcomes by site and participant status for middle school and high school programs is shown in Exhibit C.1.

The analysis of impacts on school performance outcomes used sample members for which roster data were available, regardless of the completeness of the survey information. Exhibit C.2 shows the school roster sample, by site and participant status for middle school and high school programs. There are 393 observations in the high school roster sample, and 211 in the middle school sample, making a total of 604 participant and comparison group observations.

C.2 Impact Estimation Methods

Impacts of the program on participant outcomes are estimated by comparing the outcomes of participants who were subject to the program with the outcomes of comparison group members who were not. Ideally, we would like the comparison group and the participant group to be identical to one another at baseline, since we are using the comparison group's behavior as an indicator of what would have happened to the participant group without exposure to the program. A significant increase in the mean outcome of participants relative to comparisons would then indicate positive program effects.

However, the two groups were not selected randomly and there are significant differences on key baseline characteristics (see Appendix C). Therefore, it is important to account for these differences so that we can be confident that the program is responsible for any significant participant-comparison differences we observe, rather than inherent characteristics of the groups themselves.

Basic Impact Estimation Method

To this end, we estimate program impacts as the difference between regression-adjusted means of the program group and the comparison group. Each outcome is regressed on a dummy variable for membership in the participant group and a series of demographic and background covariates from the baseline survey for the comparison group, along with the pre-program measure of the outcome. This procedure purges the variation in the outcomes from any effects of observable differences between program and comparison groups, as well as any unmeasured differences that do not change over time. The regression covariates are shown in Exhibit C.3.

Exhibit C.1
Analysis Sample for Survey-Based Outcomes, by School Type, Site and Program Status

Site	Participant Group	Comparison Group	Total
Middle School Sites			
Campus Middle School Englewood, CO	38	33	71
Redlands Middle School Grand Junction, CO	35	37	72
Forest Park/Springfield Public Schools Springfield, MA	2	17	19
Total	75	87	162
High School Sites			
Medway High School Medway, MA	26	22	48
Fall River 2000 Fall River, MA	22	13	35
North Olmstead High School North Olmstead, OH	53	49	102
Toledo Magic Makers Toledo, OH	23	15	38
Lancaster High School Lancaster, SC	20	49	69
Britten's Neck High School Gresham, SC	25	18	43
Total	169	166	335

Exhibit C.2
ANALYSIS SAMPLE FOR SCHOOL PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES, BY SCHOOL TYPE, SITE AND PROGRAM STATUS

Site	Participant Group	Comparison Group	Total
Middle School Sites			
Campus Middle School Englewood, CO	42	38	80
Redlands Middle School Grand Junction, CO	44	44	88
Forest Park/Springfield Public Schools Springfield, MA	17	26	43
Total	103	108	211
High School Sites			
Medway High School Medway, MA	27	25	52
Fall River 2000 Fall River, MA	30	19	49
North Olmstead High School North Olmstead, OH	56	52	108
Toledo Magic Makers Toledo, OH	25	26	51
Lancaster High School Lancaster, SC	39	48	87
Britten's Neck High School Gresham, SC	28	18	46
Total	205	188	393

Exhibit C.3

BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS USED AS COVARIATES IN IMPACT REGRESSIONS, BY PROGRAM TYPE

Baseline Covariates		High School	Middle School
Gender			
	(Male)		
	Female	✓	✓
Ethnicity			
	(White, non-Hispanic)		
	Black, non-Hispanic	✓	✓
	Asian, Pacific Islander, American Indian, or Alaskan Native	✓	✓
Grade [a]			
	6	✓	✓
	7		✓
	8	✓	
	9	✓	
	10	✓	
	11	✓	
	12		
Primary language			
	(Speaks English at home)		
	Doesn't speak English at home	✓	
Environmental stability			
	(Lives with both parents)		
	Doesn't live with both parents	✓	✓
	Changed schools in past 12 months	✓	✓
	(Hasn't changed schools in past 12 months)		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Exhibit A.3 *(continued)*
BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS USED AS COVARIATES IN IMPACT REGRESSIONS, BY PROGRAM TYPE

Baseline Covariates		High School	Middle School
Homework	Fewer than 2 hours per week spent on homework	✓	✓
	(More than 2 hours per week spent on homework)		
Academically at-risk			
	Ever repeated a grade	✓	✓
	(Never repeated a grade)		
At-risk behavior			
	Had alcoholic drink in last 30 days	✓	
	(No alcohol use in last 30 days)		
	Used illegal drugs in last 30 days	✓	
	(No illegal drug use in last 30 days)		
	In group fight, hurt someone, or used weapon to get something in last 6 months	✓	
	(Not involved in above in last 6 months)		
	Ever arrested and charged with a crime	✓	
	(Never arrested or charged with crime)		

Exhibit A.3 *(continued)*
BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS USED AS COVARIATES IN IMPACT REGRESSIONS, BY PROGRAM TYPE

Baseline Covariates		High School	Middle School
	Ever been or made someone pregnant	✓	
	(Never been or made someone pregnant)		
Work/Volunteer history			
	Average hours per week worked last summer [b]	✓	✓
	Average hours per week volunteered in last 6 months [c]	✓	✓
Positive values			
	Has positive values	✓	✓
	(Doesn't have positive values)		
Extracurricular activity			
	Has participated in last 6 months	✓	✓
	(Hasn't participated in last 6 months)		
Baseline dependent variable			
	Baseline value of outcome [d]	✓	✓

Each covariate is a dummy variable, except where noted. Variables in parentheses are omitted from the regressions to avoid exact collinearity. ✓ indicates variable is a covariate in regression.

[a] The primarily high school program Fall River 2000 included some middle school students. Therefore, dummy variables for the middle school grades are present in the high school impact regressions.
[b] A continuous measure of hours worked per week.
[c] A continuous measure of hours volunteered per week, obtained by multiplying weeks volunteered in last 6 months by hours per week volunteered, and dividing result by 26.
[d] Measure is continuous or binary depending on outcome.

All of the covariates in the exhibit are dummy variables, except where noted, and variables in parentheses are omitted from the regressions to avoid multicollinearity. Letting y_i be the observed outcome for respondent i, X_i a vector of covariates, and p_i a dummy variable equal to 1 for participants and 0 for comparisons, the estimated regression can be written as[1]:

$$y_i = a + b(1-p_i)X_i + cp_i$$

Program impacts are estimated by taking the difference between the mean of the outcome for the participant group and the predicted mean of the outcome for the participant group had they not participated in the program:

$$\text{Impact} = c - b\bar{X}_p$$

where $\bar{X}_p$ is the mean vector of covariates for the participant group. All impacts are estimated separately for middle school and high school respondents.

Subgroup Impact Estimation

To compute the impact estimates for subgroups shown in Chapter Five, a separate regression was estimated for each set of complementary subgroups (e.g., the two gender subgroups). Defining a dummy variable for membership in each subgroup, we regress the outcome on the subgroup dummy variables, the interactions of the participation dummy with the subgroup dummy variables, and the comparison group values of baseline covariates in Exhibit C.2 (certain baseline covariates are omitted to avoid multicollinearity when necessary). The estimated program impacts for each subgroup are derived by subtracting the predicted mean outcome of the participant group in the absence of the program (the corre-

1. Technically minded readers may note that estimating the coefficients of X using only information from the comparison group is nonstandard. It has been more common to use both comparison group and program group observations to estimate the coefficients. The importance of X in the regression, however, is to adjust the outcomes of comparison group members to the level that would be expected if their characteristics matched those of the program group. This adjustment should reflect the behavior of nonparticipants only. Using all observations estimates the coefficients for a mix of participant and comparison group members, depending on relative sample size, which may lead to biased impact estimates. It follows that the estimation of covariate coefficients should use only comparison group baseline information.

sponding term to $b\overline{X}_p$ shown above) from each of the computed coefficients on the participant-subgroup interaction variables. A two-tailed t test of each of these coefficients tests the null hypothesis of no impact on the mean outcome of the appropriate subgroup.

To test the null hypothesis that impacts on complementary subgroups do not differ from each other, an F test is performed by estimating a supplementary regression in which the participant-subgroup interactions are replaced by the uninteracted participant group dummy variable. This regression restricts the impacts on the subgroups to be equal. The F test compares the sums of squared residuals from the restricted and unrestricted regressions.

C.3 Sample Weights and Imputation

As shown in Exhibits C.1 and C.2, the ratio of program group to control group members varies across the study sites. If there are unmeasured site characteristics that affect the outcome of interest, this difference in the distributions of the two groups among sites could result in a correlation between program status and outcomes that could bias the impact estimates. For example, concentration of the program group in sites that, for reasons unrelated to the program, have more positive outcome levels would increase the difference in outcomes between program and comparison groups and cause the estimated impacts to overstate the true effects of the program.

To avoid this potential bias, in the impact regressions sample observations were weighted so that within each site the weighted sum of comparison group members was equal to the weighted sum of program group members, and the weighted sum of all sample members within a site was equal to that site's share of the total unweighted sample.

In order to make use of all available followup information when estimating impacts, missing baseline covariates were handled in one of two ways. For covariates whose missing data rate was less than 5 percent, missing variables were assigned the site-level mean for the participant or comparison group. Where the missing data rate was 5 percent or greater, a dummy variable reflecting the missing status was inserted into the impact regression. Overall, the data values for most respondents were remarkably complete. Only 3 of 17 baseline characteristics had missing value rates greater than 5 percent.

APPENDIX D

DEFINITIONS OF SCALES AND OTHER OUTCOME MEASURES

This appendix provides information on the various data sources and outcome measures used in the participant impact study and, in particular, defines the outcome measures that were derived from combinations of survey items. Overall, there were more than 20 separate outcome measures used in the study, including both survey items and data from school records. Within that mix, there are four types of grouped outcomes on the baseline and followup surveys, including: measures of attitudes, the majority of which are psychometric scales whose component items are designed to be scored and interpreted together; measures of community service involvement; a measure of excessive alcohol use; and a measure of service quality formed from the responses given by participants to program experience questions on the followup survey. Each measure is defined and briefly discussed in the sections that follow. The complete formatted surveys are found in Appendix G.

D.1 DATA SOURCES: SURVEYS AND SCHOOL RECORD DATA

There were two major data sources for the participant impact study. The first was a set of pre- and post-program surveys administered to participants and comparison group members at the beginning and end of the program period and designed to collect a wide range of attitudinal and behavioral information, as well as information on participant characteristics. The second data source was local school record and program data provided by program staff. These were both supplemented by in-person interviews with program participants and other local observers.

Pre- and Post-Program Surveys. The participant and comparison group surveys were designed to collect information on a broad array of participant attitudes, behaviors, and characteristics using a combination of formal attitudinal scales and individual questions. Approximately 20 different scales or topics were addressed in the survey, ranging from a measure of personal and social responsibility to questions about involvement in a range of risk behaviors. Essentially the same survey was used for middle and high school-aged youth (the questions on risk behaviors were not included in the middle school surveys) and for participants

and comparison group members. Exhibit D.1 provides a summary of the survey items; copies of the pre- and post-program surveys are included in Appendix G.

In developing the surveys, an effort was made to draw on existing attitudinal scales and on questionnaires that were being used in studies of similar programs. The six major sources for survey questions were:

1. Scales measuring attitudes towards personal and social responsibility originally developed for the Conrad and Hedin experiential education evaluation and modified by the Search Institute for use in the evaluation of the National Service Learning Initiative.[1]

2. Scales measuring students' sense of educational competence based on the Connell Multidimensional Measure of Children's Perceptions of Control.[2]

3. Questions identifying past and planned service activities derived from Amato's Personality and Social Network Involvement as Predictors of Helping Behavior in Everyday Life.[3]

4. Scales on tolerance of cultural diversity, communication skills, and work orientation from the Greenberger Psychosocial Maturity Inventory.[4]

5. Questions pertaining to learning experience, social values, and risk behaviors derived from the Search Institute's Profiles of Student Life Survey.[5]

6. Questions pertaining to quality of program experience, from the Conrad and Hedin study of experiential education.[6]

---

1. See Dan Conrad and Diane Hedin, *Instruments and Scoring Guide of the Experiential Education Evaluation Project* (St. Paul: Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota, 1981) for the original instrument.

2. James P. Connell, "A New Multidimensional Measure of Children's Perceptions of Control," *Child Development*, 56:4 (August, 1985) 1018-41.

3. Paul R. Amato, "Personality and Social Network Involvement as Predictors of Helping Behavior in Everyday Life," *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 53, 1 (1990), 31-43.

4. Ellen Greenberger and Lloyd Bond, *User's Manual for the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory*, 1984.

5. The Profiles of Student Life Survey is the basis for Search Institute's national study of 6th through 12th grade students. See Search Institute, *The Troubled Journey: A Profile of American Youth* (Respecteen, 1990).

6. Conrad and Hedin, *Instruments*. The participant data on quality of service experience was reported in Chapter Four.

Exhibit D.1
SURVEY DATA

Elements/Domains	Data/Source
Identifying Information	Name, Student ID, Birth Date, School Name, Project Information
Personal Characteristics (baseline only)	Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Grade, Living Arrangements, English Speaking, Prior Work Experience, Reason for Joining.
Program Satisfaction and Experience (post-program only; participants only)	Conrad and Hedin, Program Experience Questions
Civic and Social Development	
Personal and Social Responsibility	Search Institute, Social Welfare, Environment, Community Involvement Scales (modification of Conrad and Hedin Personal and Social Responsibility Scale).
Social Values	Search Institute, Profiles of Student Life.
Acceptance of Cultural Diversity	Tolerance Subscale, Greenberger Psychosocial Maturity Inventory.
Communication Skills	Communication Subscale, Greenberger Psychosocial Maturity Inventory.
Work Orientation	Work Orientation Subscale, Greenberger Psychosocial Maturity Inventory.
Involvement in Extracurricular Activities	Search Institute, Profiles of Student Life
Educational Aspirations and Expectations	Questions on degree students would like to attain, expect to attain.
Involvement in Service	
Involvement in Formal and Informal Helping Behaviors, Previous 6 Months	Amato, "Predictors of Helping Behavior" questions.
Average Volunteer Hours	
Likelihood of Future Involvement in Formal Helping Behaviors	Amato, "Predictors of Helping Behavior" questions.
Academic Performance	
Educational Competence	Connell Scale, Children's Perceptions of Control.
Learning Experience/School Engagement	Search Institute, Profiles of Student Life.
School-Related Behavior	Hours of Homework, Ever Dropped Out, Repeated a Grade, Get Along with Teachers (Search Institute, Profiles of Student Life).
Risk Behaviors (High School Only)	
Alcohol and drug use, pregnancy, violent behavior, and arrests	Search Institute, Profiles of Student Life.

Each of these scales is discussed in more detail in the sections that follow. Where existing measures were not available for concepts deemed important to the evaluation, however, new survey questions were designed.

School Record and Program Data. In addition to the data collected through the participant and comparison group surveys, the intensive study sites also supplied data collected from school and program records. School record information included socioeconomic data (for example, free or reduced cost lunch status), as well as information on attendance, course failures, suspensions, and grades (Exhibit D.2). Programs also supplied individual roster data on hours and types of service for program participants. The school record data were collected for the semester prior to program participation (usually the spring semester of the 1992-93 school year) and for the last semester of the 1993-94 school year, which was generally the final semester of program participation.[7]

Exhibit D.2
SCHOOL RECORD AND PROGRAM DATA

Elements/Domains	Data
Student Characteristics	Free Lunch Status, Educationally Disadvantaged, Prior Program Participation
Academic Performance	Attendance, Suspensions, Failed One or More Courses, Ever Repeated a Grade, Grade Point Average, Standardized Reading and Math scores.
Program Record Information	Hours and Types of Service

7. Because of the schedule for the evaluation reports, it was not possible to collect true post-program school record information—that is, data from the school year following program participation (1994-95).

D.2 Measures of Attitudes

Several criteria were used to select measures of attitudes for the evaluation. Among the vast number of attitudinal domains and psychometric scales available, specific measures were adopted that:

- Figured most prominently in the stated goals of community service programs;
- Could likely be affected by the program within the limited time period covered by the evaluation; and
- Could be measured on self-administered survey forms within the resource constraints of the evaluation.

To this end, the Abt/Brandeis study team consulted with selected program staff at the outset of the evaluation as to the intended effects of their programs. We then undertook a detailed review of the literature on service learning and community service and talked with CNCS staff and other researchers in these areas to identify candidate domains and measures. In selecting domains and measures, the research team worked closely with staff from Public/Private Ventures and Search Institute, as well as Dr. Thomas Cook, who served as a consultant to the study.

Ultimately, four existing scales were adopted either in whole or in part, generating eight outcomes. A final attitudinal measure based on responses to a set of questions about engagement in learning added another outcome. These are described below.

Perceived Control (Connell Scale)

Previous research has suggested that an important contributor to success in school is an individual's expectation about whether he or she has any direct control over academic outcomes. Dr. James Connell of Public/Private Ventures has developed a scale measuring students' perceived control in school based on results of an earlier study of elementary school students that examined the concept of perceived control and its relation to school achievement.[8] Questions are designed to assess students' beliefs pertaining to three constructs: 1) strategy beliefs—

8. Skinner, Ellen A., James G. Wellborn, and James P. Connell, "What It Takes to Do Well in School and Whether I've Got It: A Process Model of Perceived Control and Children's Engagement and Achievement in School," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1990, Vol 82, No. 1, pp. 22-32.

expectations about what is required to do well in school; 2) capacity beliefs—do they believe they have what it takes to execute the strategies; and 3) control beliefs—expectations about whether students can influence academic outcomes. The scale consists of 20 items:

> For each of the following statements, please indicated whether you strongly agree, agree a little, disagree a little, or strongly disagree.
>
> 1. I can do well in school if I want to.
> 2. I can't work very hard in school.
> 3. The best way for me to get good grades is to get my teacher to like me.
> 4. I'm pretty smart in school.
> 5. I don't know what it takes to get good grades in school.
> 6. I'm pretty lucky at getting good grades.
> 7. If I don't do well on my schoolwork, it's because I didn't try hard enough.
> 8. I can't get my teachers to like me.
> 9. I can't do well in school
> 10. Trying hard is the best way for me to do well in school.
> 11. I don't know how to keep myself from getting bad grades.
> 12. I won't do well in school if the teachers don't like me.
> 13. I have to be smart to get good grades.
> 14. I am unlucky in school.
> 15. I can work really hard in school.
> 16. I have to be lucky to do well in school.
> 17. If I'm not smart, I won't get good grades.
> 18. If I'm unlucky, I won't do well in school.
> 19. I can get teachers to like me.
> 20. I'm not very smart in school.

The questions are combined into a total score by scoring the response to each question on a four-point scale and computing average scores for items that promote perceived control and those that undermine perceived control, and subtracting the latter from the former, adjusting for reverse scored items.[9] A higher score indicates stronger engagement in school and perceived control. The mean score for this scale in the comparison group was 1.8, with a range of 1.2 to 2.7.

Personal and Social Responsibility (Search Institute Scale)

This scale was devised by Search Institute for the evaluation of the National Service Learning Initiative. It is based in part on Conrad and Hedin's Personal and Social Responsibility

9. The detailed scoring formula is available from Abt Associates, Inc.

Scale developed for the Experiential Education Evaluation Project.[10] These are among the few known scales that directly address attitudes toward social responsibility.

The measure is composed of an attitude subscale and an intent subscale. We adopt only the former, since the followup period in our study is short and it has been hypothesized that a change in attitude is likely to precede changes in intention. There are three domains within the attitude subscale corresponding to different types of social involvement, each with a separate score: social welfare, environmental, and community involvement.

The new scale has been developed with the rationale that youth who are involved in service activities will be more likely to understand and endorse the belief that each individual shares responsibility for the welfare of others, the environment, and the community in general.

The attitude subscale consists of 15 statements with two sentence endings numbered 1 and 4. Respondents were asked to indicate how they would finish the sentence by circling a number between 1 and 4 (we show only the sentence endings below; see Appendix E for the actual question format):

1. Taking care of people who are having difficulty caring for themselves. . .

is everyone's responsibility, including mine	is not my responsibility.

2. When it comes to saving energy . . .

it's everyone's job to use less	people worry too much about it.

3. Getting actively involved in political or social issues . . .

is not that important to community life	is an important way to improve the community.

4. Cleaning up parks or helping with other environmental projects . . .

should be done by people who live in the area	should be done by paid workers.

5. Helping others without being paid . . .

is not something people should feel they have to do	is something everyone should feel they have to do.

6. Being concerned about state and local issues is . . .

10. Conrad, Dan and Diane Hedin, *Executive Summary of the Final Report of the Experiential Education Project*. Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota, 1985.

an important responsibility for everybody	not something in which most people should be involved.

7. Keeping the environment safe and clean . . .

is something I don't feel personally responsible for	is something I feel personally responsible for.

8. Helping a person in need . . .

is something people should do only for friends or relatives	is something people should do for anyone, even if they don't know them.

9. Doing something about school problems . . .

is a job for only a few people who want to be involved	is something every person should be involved in.

10. Helping other people . . .

is something I feel a strong need to do	is something I prefer to let others do.

11. Being actively involved in community issues . . .

is something I feel personally responsible for	is something I don't feel personally responsible for.

12. The problems of pollution and toxic waste . . .

are not something for which individuals are responsible	are everyone's responsibility to stop.

13. Helping other people . . .

is something I feel personally responsible for	is something I don't feel personally responsible for.

14. Recycling cans, bottles, and other things . . .

is too much hassle for me to bother with	is everyone's job including mine.

15. Working to improve the community . . .

is an important job for everyone, even beginners	is only the job of people who know how to do it.

We calculated a score for each domain and a total score for the subscale. An individual's score is a sum of the individual item responses, with adjustments made for reverse scoring. A high score indicates a belief that individuals have a responsibility to act on behalf

of the larger social good in terms of helping others, protecting the environment, and addressing community problems in general. At baseline, comparison group members had a mean total score of 57.7, with a minimum score of 15 and a maximum of 75. The social welfare subscale produced a comparison group mean of 18.9, with scores ranging from 6 to 25; the environmental subscale had a mean of 20 with a range between 6 and 25; and the community involvement subscale had a mean of 18.8, with a minimum score of 2 and a maximum of 25.

Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (Greenberger Scale)

The Psychosocial Maturity Inventory, developed by Dr. Ellen Greenberger, is a questionnaire composed of nine different subscales intended to measure attributes of mature functioning in society. Since its development in 1972, the Inventory has been used to assess the level of social and psychological maturity of a vast number of students of varying ages. For example, it has been used in a study over 40,000 students in grades 7 through 11 in South Carolina and was administered to approximately 2,000 11th graders in Pennsylvania as part of a study on adolescent socialization.[11]

We used the 8th grade version of three subscales: communication skills, work orientation, and cultural diversity (tolerance). Since we did not administer all elements of the Inventory, only subscale scores were available.

The three subscales consist of a total of 23 questions:

> For each of the following statements, please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree a little, disagree a little, or strongly disagree.
>
> Communication
>
> 1. It is hard to talk to someone you don't know.
> 2. In a discussion, I often find it hard to understand what people are saying.
> 3. I do not mix well with other people.
> 4. People find it hard to figure me out from what I say.
> 5. I often forget to listen to what others are saying.
> 6. It is hard for me to speak my thoughts clearly.
> 7. It is not hard to give a talk in front of other people.
> 8. I am not good at describing things in writing.

11. Greenberger, Ellen, "Education and the Acquisition of Psychosocial Maturity." In D.C. McClelland (Ed.), *The Development of Social Maturity*. New York: Irvington, 1982.

Work Orientation

9. I often don't finish work I start.
10. I often leave my homework unfinished if there are a lot of good TV shows on that evening.
11. I seldom get behind in my work
12. I often go from one thing to another before finishing any one of them.
13. Hard work is never fun.
14. I find it hard to stick to anything that takes a long time to do.

Cultural Diversity (Tolerance)

15. It would bother me to work for a person whose race or ethnicity is different from mine.
16. I would not make friends with a person who had very different manners and clothes from most of my other friends.
17. It's good for people of different races or ethnic groups to get together at parties and social events.
18. I would rather not live in a neighborhood where there are people of different races or ethnic groups.
19. I would not mind working closely on a job with a person whose race is different from mine.
20. If a friend whose ideas about religion are very different from mine gave me a religious article to read, I wouldn't read it.
21. Allowing people to speak their ideas freely can't really help us find ways to improve our country.
22. Spanish speaking people who live in the United States will feel happier in the long run if they only speak English.
23. I don't think I could be close friends with a person with disabilities.

Individual scores for the subscales are calculated by taking the mean score of the items in each subscale, where an item score ranges from 1 (disagree strongly with statement) to 4 (agree strongly with statement), reverse scoring some items.[12] An individual subscale score is recorded only if a majority of subscale items have been answered.

At baseline, the mean score in the comparison group for the communication subscale was 2.8, with scores ranging from 1.4 to 4; the mean for the work orientation subscale was 2.8, with a minimum score of 1.3 and a maximum of 4; and the comparison group mean of the cultural diversity subscale was 3.3, with a range of 1.8 to 4.

12. For detailed scoring directions, see Greenberger, Ellen and Lloyd Bond, *User's Manual for the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory*, 1984.

Engagement in Learning (Search Institute)

These items have been used by Search Institute in a study of almost 47,000 youths in grades 6 through 12.[13] While they do not form a normed attitudinal scale, the items are intended to capture engagement and achievement motivation in school. The items appear as follows:

> For each of the following statements, please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree a little, disagree a little, or strongly disagree.
>
> 1. At school, I try as hard as I can to do my best work.
> 2. I like school.
> 3. My teachers really care about me.
> 4. It bothers me when I don't do something well.
> 5. I don't care how I do in school.
> 6. My teachers don't pay much attention to me.
> 7. I get a lot of encouragement at my school.

We grouped the items together into a single outcome by counting the number of statements for which each respondent indicated "strongly agree" or "agree a little." Since items 5 and 6 are worded negatively, they are reverse scored. Thus, for these two items we counted whether the respondent indicated "strongly disagree" or "disagree a little." The mean score among comparison group members at baseline was 5.6, with a range of 0 to 7.

Positive Values (Search Institute)

This group of items was developed by Search Institute as part of its survey of 6-12 grade youth. Together, the responses assess the degree to which respondents possess positive social values. There are five statements:

> How important is each of the following to you in your life? Please check whether it is not important at all, not very important, somewhat important, or very important.
>
> 1. Having lots of money?
> 2. Helping other people?
> 3. Having lots of fun and good times?
> 4. Helping to reduce hunger and poverty in the world?
> 5. Being popular or well-liked?

13. Search Institute, "The Troubled Journey: A Profile of American Youth." *Respecteen*, 1990.

Items 2 and 4 embody clearly benevolent values. Following Search Institute, we created a single dichotomous variable for each respondent by recording whether they indicate that either item 2 or 4 is "very important" or "somewhat important." The mean for comparison group members at baseline was 0.8.

D.3 Measures of Community Service Involvement

The survey items which attempt to assess the extent of involvement in the community can be grouped into eight different measures. These measures reflect several outcome categories, including participation in extracurricular activities, personal helping behavior, likelihood of future community involvement, and hours spent performing volunteer work.

Participated in Extracurricular Activities in the Last Six Months

These four questions are based on similar questions developed by Search Institute:

> During the past 6 months, did you participate in any of the following activities or organizations?
>
> 1. School or non-school sports team
> 2. Afterschool club (such as math club or school boosters)
> 3. Religious youth group
> 4. Non-school social club

A single measure was derived by tallying the number of activities that each respondent participated in. Among comparison group members at baseline, the mean score was 1.6, with a minimum score of 0 and a maximum of 4.

Engaged in Personal Helping Behavior in the Last Six Months

We asked sample members 13 questions about specific planned helping activities, divided into two categories based on items devised by Dr. Paul Amato for a study of helping behavior.[14] Research has suggested that everyday helping behavior of individuals is typically planned rather than spontaneous and often involves people they know rather than strangers. On

14. See Amato, Paul R. "Personality and Social NetWork Involvement as Predictors of Helping Behavior in Everyday Life." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 53, No. 1, 1990, pp. 31-43.

this basis, two categories of helping activities were included in the surveys— formal helping behavior and informal helping behavior. The items include:

In the past 6 months have you done any of the following things?

Formal helping behavior

1. Volunteered for a community organization that does socially useful work or gotten involved in a community service activity?
2. Served as a volunteer counselor, mentor, or tutor?
3. Written a letter to a newspaper, elected official, or government agency about an issue that you thought was important to the community?
4. Gotten involved in a recycling project?
5. Taken part in a community project such as cleaning up a neighborhood park or working in a food bank?
6. Visited or helped take care of someone in a nursing home or hospital?

Informal helping behavior

7. Looked after or visited a sick friend or relative?
8. Bought or picked up an item for a person who was not able to pick it up him/herself?
9. Had a talk with a friend or relative about a personal problem he or she was having?
10. Helped to take care of a friend's or neighbor's house or property while they were away or unable to take care of it themselves?
11. Spent time teaching a friend or relative a skill that you have, such as playing a musical instrument, speaking another language, or cooking?
12. Lent a possession such as a book, record, or car to a friend or relative?
13. Looked after the children of a friend or relative without being paid?

We produced two outcomes for each category of activities: whether or not the respondent was engaged in any helping behavior, and a count of the number of helping behaviors. Among comparison group members at baseline, 75 percent participated in some formal helping behavior, while over 99 percent engaged in some informal helping behavior. The mean number of formal helping activities in the comparison group was 1.7, ranging from 0 to 6, and the mean number of informal helping activities was 4.6, ranging from 0 to 7.

Likelihood of Future Community Involvement in Five Years

We asked respondents whether they expected to be involved in any of the formal helping behaviors, or to vote, five years from now. There are seven items in total:

Five years from now, how likely is it that you will be involved in the following activities? (response categories: very likely, somewhat likely, somewhat unlikely, very unlikely)

1. Volunteer for a community organization that does socially useful work or get involved in a community service activity.
2. Serve as a volunteer counselor, mentor, or tutor.
3. Write a letter to a newspaper, elected official, or government agency about an issue that you think is important to the community.
4. Get involved in a recycling project.
5. Take part in a community project such as cleaning up a neighborhood park or working in a food bank.
6. Visit or help take care of someone in a nursing home or hospital.
7. Vote in federal, state, or local elections (when I am old enough).

Two outcomes were generated from responses to these items, analogous to the helping behavior outcomes: whether a respondent is very likely or somewhat likely to participate in any activities five years from now, and the number of activities for which participation is either very likely or somewhat likely. Among comparison group members at baseline, 93 percent said they were likely to have future community involvement in five years, with a mean number of activities of 4.3, ranging from 0 to 4.

Hours Doing Volunteer Work over Last Six Months

This outcome is derived from responses to two survey questions:

1. Over the last 6 months (26 weeks) in how many weeks did you do some volunteer work?
2. On average, during those weeks that you volunteered, how many hours per week did you volunteer?

Hours doing volunteer work over the last six months was determined by multiplying weeks volunteered by average hours per week volunteered. The mean hours volunteered at baseline in the comparison group was 22.3, with a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 520.

D.4 Measure of Excessive Alcohol Use

A series of four questions were asked only of high school students to determine whether respondents drink alcohol, and if so, to what extent:

1. In the past 30 days, have you had anything alcoholic to drink, such as a glass of wine, a beer, or a mixed drink? (yes or no)
2. If yes, how many days did you have a drink? (1-2; 3-5; 6-9; 10-19; 20-30)

3. In the past 30 days, did you ever drink five or more drinks of wine,beer, or liquor at one time or sitting? (yes or no)
4. If yes, how many times? (once; twice; 3-5 times; 6-9 times; 10 or more times)

We estimated impacts on two outcomes derived from this set of questions: whether the respondent consumed any alcohol in the past 30 days (item 1), and whether the respondent used alcohol excessively in the past 30 days. The latter outcome is affirmative if either a respondent had a drink on six or more days in the last 30 or had five or more drinks in a sitting during the last 30 days. Among comparison group members who responded to the items, 40 percent had consumed alcohol in the month prior to the baseline survey, and 40 percent of those who consumed some alcohol had also consumed excessively.

D.5 Measure of Program Experience

On the followup survey, program participants were asked a series of questions about their program experience. Among these were a list of features of a community service experience taken largely from Conrad and Hedin's Community Service Checklist.[15] The specific features are those expected to be present in a successful program. Indeed, Conrad and Hedin found that characteristics of an individual's program experience were strong predictors of pre-post gains observed during the Experiential Education Evaluation Project.

The measure comprises 13 items:

> The following list describes some features of a community service experience. Please describe <u>your</u> community service experience by answering whether it was practically never, once in a great while, sometimes, fairly often, or very often.
>
> 1. Had real responsibilities.
> 2. Had challenging tasks.
> 3. Made important decisions.
> 4. Discussed my experiences with teachers.
> 5. Did things myself instead of observing.
> 6. Had freedom to develop and use my own ideas.
> 7. Discussed my experiences with my family and friends.
> 8. Adults at the site took a personal interest in me.
> 9. Had freedom to explore my own interests.
> 10. Had a variety of tasks to do at the site.
> 11. Needed more help from my supervisor.

15. Conrad, Dan and Diane Hedin, *Instruments and Scoring Guide of the Experiential Education Evaluation Project*. Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota, 1985.

12. Adults criticized me or my work.
13. Felt I made a contribution.

Individual scores were calculated by averaging the item scores, where an item received 1 point if the response was "practically never," up to 5 points for a response of "very often." The mean score among participants was 3.8, with a minimum score of 1.5 and a maximum of 4.9.

We calculated the mean score on this scale of program experience, for each high school program site, weighting each item equally, and interacted this value with treatment status in our impact regressions to measure how impacts varied with program design. This procedure and its results are discussed in Chapter Five.

APPENDIX E

BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANT AND COMPARISON GROUP SAMPLE MEMBERS

This appendix provides supplementary tables showing the baseline characteristics of the participant and comparison group members in the impact analysis sample, as well as the characteristics of all participants in the intensive study sites for whom baseline data were available. Below, we provide a brief description of the analysis sample and the organization of the tables.

The main analysis sample was formed by matching completed baseline survey data to completed followup survey data in the sites with comparison group members. School records data was then merged with the matched sample to produce the final analysis data set. The school performance measures, including grade point average, course failures and days absent, were analyzed using all observations for which we had school records, regardless of the completeness of survey data. Appendix A describes the formation of the analysis samples in more detail.

The tables show over 50 baseline characteristics, separately for the high school and middle school analysis samples. The characteristics of the analysis sample are expressed as weighted means and weighted percentages, using weights established for the impact analysis (described in Appendix A). Columns (2) and (6) in each table show the distribution of characteristics for program group members, while columns (3) and (7) do the same for the comparison group members. The results of statistical tests of the difference between the program and comparison group in each program sample are shown in columns (4) and (8). Finally, the first and fifth columns show the distributions of characteristics among all participants in the high school and middle school sample, including those participants for whom we did not have complete followup information and thus do not appear in the main analysis sample.

One of two tests of group differences was performed on each baseline characteristic, depending on the nature of the characteristic. For characteristics with multiple attributes, such as ethnicity and grade, we performed a chi-square test of the difference between the program group and comparison group distributions. For dichotomous characteristics, such as the fraction

of sample members who are educationally disadvantaged, or the fraction who had been arrested in the last six months, we performed a two-tailed t-test on the difference in means.

Overall, the results indicate that there are statistically significant differences between the program and comparison group members in both the high school and middle school analysis samples across a variety of baseline characteristics. These differences are explicitly accounted for in the estimation procedure that generated program impacts.

SUBTITLE B1: BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Ethnicity				*				
White, non-Hispanic	66.4	71.8	58.7		63.9	89.3	87.1	
Black, non-Hispanic	22.1	21.0	31.7		14.6	1.3	1.4	
Hispanic	8.5	4.8	4.1		15.2	4.0	4.5	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.9	1.2	4.0		2.5	1.3	2.8	
Other	2.1	1.2	1.6		3.8	4.0	4.2	
Number missing	5	1	0		1	0	0	
Gender								*
Male	39.7	39.9	48.0		44.3	45.3	30.9	
Female	61.2	60.1	52.0		55.7	54.7	69.1	
Number missing	0	0	0		1	0	0	

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t-tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

SUBTITLE B1: BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Current school grade				***				
6	0.8	1.2	0		34.8	46.7	46.7	
7	0.4	.6	0		18.7	2.7	2.7	
8	3.8	3.6	0		43.9	50.7	50.7	
9	7.9	6.0	18.4		0	0	0	
10	27.2	23.6	21.1		2.6	0	0	
11	18.4	14.0	6.5		0	0	0	
12	41.4	51.0	54.0		0	0	0	
Number missing	1	1	9		4	0	0	
Speak English at home	95.4	95.8	97.1		96.9	100	99.8	
Number missing	0	0	0		0	0	3	
Economically disadvantaged	45.1	44.0	50.8		34.3	5.6	1.5	
Number missing		27	33			14	39	

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

SUBTITLE B1: BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Educationally disadvantaged	20.4	12.2	16.7		26.4	8.8	0	**
Number missing		1	12			41	30	
Living arrangements								
Both parents	56.7	60.4	64.6		67.3	81.3	82.0	
Mother only	28.8	28.3	30.3		25.2	14.7	12.9	
Father only	5.8	5.4	2.8		3.1	2.7	4.8	
Other relatives	8.8	8.3	2.9	**	10.7	2.7	2.7	
Other guardians	3.7	2.4	1.5		1.9	4.0	.2	
Spent night(s) in shelter during past 6 months	5.8	1.2	1.3		1.3	0	.3	
Number missing	0	0	2		5	0	1	
Ever been/caused pregnancy	9.1	4.3	2.4			NA		
Number missing	9	4	6		159			

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t-tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Have own children, among those who have ever been/caused pregnancy	47.6	50.0	62.2			NA		
Number missing	219	163	161		159			
Average number of children						NA		
All sample members	0	0	0					
Those with children	1.2	1.5	1.0		0			
Ever repeated a grade	33.1	23.9	22.1		14.9	8.2	7.4	
Number missing	4	1	0		5	2	0	
Ever dropped out of school	13.6	0	1.0		2.6	0	0	
Number missing	4	1	0		4	2	0	
Failed one or more courses last year	33.5	18.9	26.4		18.4	24.2	0	***
Number missing		4	35			42	54	

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

SUBTITLE B1: BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Days absent from school last year	7.9	7.5	7.1		4.9	4.8	2.8	**
Grade point average last year	2.2	2.1	2.1		3.3	3.4	3.4	
Changed schools in last 12 months	22.5	8.9	12.1		35.4	46.7	38.4	
Number missing	0	0	2		1	0	1	
Ever involved in group fight	32.3	30.0	15.0	***		NA		
Number missing	8	3	2		159			
Ever hurt someone enough to need bandage or doctor	47.2	13.8	12.5			NA		
Number missing	7	1	2		159			

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

SUBTITLE B1: BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Ever used knife or gun or other weapon to get something from a person	6.4	3.6	2.8			NA		
Number missing	6	1	2		159			
Ever involved in violent behavior	38.7	34.2	21.5	***		NA		
Number missing	8	3	2		159			
Ever been arrested and charged with crime	10.7	4.8	1.8			NA		
Number missing	6	1	2		159			
Consumed any alcohol in last 30 days	39.4	37.3	40.8			NA		
Number missing	9	3	10		159			

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t-tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Excessive alcohol use last 30 days, among those with any alcohol use	43.1	43.6	43.7			NA		
Number missing	117	94	82		159			
Used illegal drugs in last 30 days	15.5	7.6	15.9	**		NA		
Number missing	8	4	4		159			
Worked for pay last summer	61.9	65.0	57.2		49.0	54.8	44.6	
Number missing	1	1	1		4	2	1	
Average hours worked per week during summer (for those who worked)	27.5	27.7	22.4	***	7.27	7.4	10.7	

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Worked for pay last school year	42.6	45.8	37.3		31.7	36.5	24.8	
Number missing	5	3	4		20	12	3	
Average hours worked per week last school year (for those who worked)	18.3	18.1	15.2	**	5.3	4.3	8.2	**
Average hours per week doing homework								
0	10.2	4.8	6.5		1.9	0	.3	
1-2	27.1	25.7	29.9		29.2	19.2	29.3	
3-5	32.2	31.8	35.1		38.3	39.7	44.4	
6-10	22.5	28.2	25.5		22.7	30.1	22.5	
11 or more	8.1	9.6	2.9		7.8	11.0	3.5	
Number missing	4	1	0		5	2	0	

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Get along well with teachers				**				
Very well	39.4	47.0	33.4		35.5	42.5	47.5	
Pretty well	54.7	50.0	60.6		57.4	56.2	51.9	
Not very well	5.5	2.4	6.0		2.6	1.4	.6	
Not well at all	.4	.6	0		4.5	0	0	
Number missing	4	0	1		4	2	0	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t-tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Engagement in learning								
At school, I try as hard as I can	86.9	87.5	82.2		95.5	98.7	99.8	
to do my best work.	77.5	79.4	75.0		77.7	80.0	92.9	**
I like school.	79.1	81.3	73.3	*	84.2	87.7	92.1	
My teachers really care about	87.2	89.8	85.3		75.3	81.1	94.2	**
me.								
It bothers me when I	86.3	91.6	87.1		92.7	94.5	94.0	
don't do	79.8	83.1	77.4		70.8	86.5	87.7	
something well.								
I care how I do in school.	74.4	74.4	61.7	**	71.5	73.0	78.4	
My teachers pay enough attention to me.								
I get a lot of encouragement at								

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t-tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Number of statements respondent strongly agreed or agreed with	5.6	5.8	5.4	***	5.6	5.9	6.4	***
Extracurricular activities during last 6 months								
School or non-school sports	57.9	66.9	53.2	**	67.1	81.1	79.4	
team	39.9	46.4	46.4		39.5	31.1	49.8	**
After school club (such as a	35.3	36.8	30.2		41.3	45.2	56.1	
math club or school boosters)	27.3	26.1	24.5		29.8	28.4	35.9	
Religious youth group								
Non-school social club								

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Participation in any extracurricular activities during last 6 months	76.9	82.7	83.5		87.5	94.6	97.9	
Number missing		1	7			1	7	
Average number of extracurricular activities	1.6	1.7	1.5	**	1.7	1.8	2.1	

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t-tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

SUBTITLE B1: BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Likely participation in community activities in 5 years	78.6	81.6	67.7	***	75.0	79.2	71.8	
Volunteer for a community organization or get involved in a community service activity	73.1	75.3	65.5	*	58.8	51.4	58.5	
Serve as a volunteer counselor, mentor, or tutor	51.3	51.8	45.0		49.7	51.4	55.4	
Write a letter to an official	73.4	75.9	68.3	**	76.3	79.2	77.9	
Get involved in a recycling	68.7	72.0	65.1		74.6	73.6	72.9	
	70.5	74.7	66.3	*	64.7	65.3	72.4	

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t-tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Very likely or somewhat likely to engage in any activities	96.1	98.2	94.1	*	95.9	97.2	98.0	
Number missing		4	4			3	6	
Importance of values								
Having lots of money	73.2	76.6	74.5		71.1	68.9	49.8	**
Helping other people	86.8	91.0	88.7		90.8	94.6	94.0	
Having lots of fun and good times	87.7	91.6	89.6		92.0	94.5	92.6	
Helping to reduce hunger and poverty in the world	82.3	83.5	76.2	*	85.3	93.2	87.7	
Being popular or well-liked	64.7	68.3	62.9		71.5	67.1	66.2	

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t-tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Importance of positive values	76.2	80.2	72.5	*	80.9	89.2	86.0	
Number missing		1	1			1	7	

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t-tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Formal helping behavior during last 6 months								
Volunteered for a community organization or gotten involved in a community service activity	57.9	60.6	33.1	***	44.1	37.0	39.7	
Served as a volunteer counselor, mentor or tutor	36.0	37.8	20.6	***	26.5	17.8	16.3	
Written a letter to an official	14.8	13.2	8.3		19.1	13.7	9.1	
Got involved in a recycling project	37.7	38.6	39.1		57.6	58.9	70.3	
Took part in a community	28.1	29.4	25.3		43.8	25.7	44.8	**
	38.2	37.6	34.9		38.4	37.0	37.7	

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Engaged in any formal helping behavior	83.9	85.4	73.0	***	81.0	78.4	91.6	**
Number missing		1	0			1	0	
Average number of formal helping activities	2.1	2.2	1.6	***	2.2	1.9	2.2	

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t-tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Informal helping behavior during last 6 months								
Looked after a sick friend	75.3	73.9	66.1		66.2	64.9	60.0	
Brought or picked up item for someone	77.0	75.2	78.0		64.2	64.9	66.4	
Talked to friend or relative about a personal problem s/he was having	82.6	83.9	86.3		58.9	58.1	61.6	
Helped take care of property while owners were away or unable to care	47.7	48.0	38.5	*	54.2	56.8	58.5	
	53.8	55.7	49.6		63.4	63.5	63.9	
	86.4	90.4	85.2		83.7	87.8	84.9	
	73.2	74.0	69.1		66.4	60.8	61.6	

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

SUBTITLE B1: BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Engaged in any informal helping activities	98.7	99.4	98.7		96.7	98.7	100	
Number missing		1	1			1	2	
Average number of informal helping activities	4.9	5.0	4.7		4.4	4.5	4.5	
Average weeks done volunteer work in last 6 months	5.1	5.8	3.3	***	3.5	3.0	3.5	
Hours per week volunteered (for those who volunteered)	4.3	4.3	2.3	***	2.9	2.4	3.7	
Perceived Control (Connell Scale)	1.8	1.8	1.9	**	1.8	1.8	1.6	***

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

SUBTITLE B1: BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	High School				Middle School			
		Analysis Sample				Analysis Sample		
	All Participants (1)	Program Group (2)	Comparison Group (3)	Test of Group Difference[a] (4)	All Participants (5)	Program Group (6)	Comparison Group (7)	Test of Group Difference[a] (8)
Personal and social responsibility (Search Institute Scale)	19.2	19.8	19.0	*	18.4	18.7	18.9	
Social welfare subscale	19.6	20.2	19.7		19.8	20.6	21.4	
Environmental subscale	18.9	19.5	19.0		18.1	18.3	19.0	
Community involvement subscale	57.7	59.5	57.7		56.2	57.6	59.3	
Total score								
Psychosocial maturity (Greenberger Scale)								
Communication subscale	2.7	2.7	2.8		2.9	3.0	2.8	***
Work orientation subscale	2.8	2.8	2.9	***	2.9	3.1	3.0	
Cultural diversity subscale	3.4	3.4	3.3		3.3	3.4	3.5	**

a Chi-square tests of differences in each characteristic's distribution between comparison and program groups were performed. Two-tailed t-tests were run on differences in means.
* Statistically significant at the 10% level; ** at the 5% level; *** at the 1% level.
All participants sample: 240 in high school, 159 in middle school. *Analysis sample size:* comparison group: 166 in high school, 87 in middle school; program group: 169 in high school, 75 in middle school.

APPENDIX F

SUBTITLE B1 SUBGROUP ANALYSIS

This appendix contains tables showing estimated impacts and tests of differences in impacts for key subgroups among high school students in the main analysis sample (described in Appendix C). They are as follows:

Table 1: Educationally At-Risk Students
Table 2: Economically Disadvantaged Students
Table 3: Males and Females
Table 4: Ethnic Groups
Table 5: Students Involved in At-Risk Social Behavior
Table 6: Students Who Volunteered More than .8 Hours per Week in Last 6 Months
Table 7: Program Type: Integrated vs. Afterschool vs. Course
Table 8: Program Type: Curricular vs. Extracurricular
Table 9: Program Type: Mean Score on Conrad-Hedin Scale
Table 10: Program Hours

Table 1. Educationally At-Risk High School Students

Outcome	Educationally At-Risk		Not Educationally At-Risk		
	Comparison Group Mean (1)	Impact (standard error) (2)	Comparison Group Mean (3)	Impact (standard error) (4)	Test of Difference in Impacts[a] (5)
Helping Behavior:					
Engaged in any formal helping behaviors	.7	.20** (.06)	.9	.05 (.04)	*
Number of formal helping activities	1.8	1.12** (.27)	2.0	1.09** (.19)	ns
Average hours per week doing volunteer work or community service in last 6 months	.7	2.31** (.45)	.6	2.97** (.30)	ns
Attitudes:					
Perceived control (Connell scale)	1.9	.03 (.06)	1.9	-.02 (.04)	ns
Personal and social responsibility (Search Institute scale)					
Social welfare subscale	17.9	.96 (.62)	18.7	.97* (.44)	ns
Environmental subscale	18.9	.32 (.69)	19.4	.89 (.49)	ns
Community involvement subscale	18.4	.55 (.59)	18.8	.65 (.42)	ns
Total Score	55.1	1.75 (1.58)	56.8	2.55* (1.12)	ns

Table 1. Educationally At-Risk High School Students (continued)

Outcome	Educationally At-Risk		Not Educationally At-Risk		
	Comparison Group Mean (1)	Impact (standard error) (2)	Comparison Group Mean (3)	Impact (standard error) (4)	Test of Difference in Impacts[a] (5)
Psychosocial maturity (Greenberger scale):					
Communications subscale	2.6	.19* (.09)	2.8	.14* (.06)	ns
Work orientation subscale	2.6	.25** (.09)	2.7	.08 (.07)	ns
Cultural diversity subscale	3.2	.01 (.09)	3.4	-.02 (.06)	ns
School Performance:					
Grade point average	1.7	-.02 (.10)	2.6	.01 (.07)	ns
Days absent during program period	14.3	-4.52** (1.54)	6.6	-1.36 (1.02)	ns
Failed 1 or more courses during program period	.5	-.13 (.10)	.1	.13 (.07)	*
At-Risk Behavior:					
Use of drugs or alcohol, fighting, or teen parenting	.5	-.05 (.09)	.6	.02 (.06)	ns

[a] T-test and F-test of differences in impacts between subgroups. ns: not statistically significant; * Statistically significant at the 5% level; ** at the 1% level.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2. Economically Disadvantaged High School Students

Outcome	Economically Disadvantaged		Not Economically Disadvantaged		
	Comparison Group Mean (1)	Impact (standard error) (2)	Comparison Group Mean (3)	Impact (standard error) (4)	Test of Difference in Impacts[a] (5)
Helping Behavior:					
Engaged in any formal helping behaviors	.8	.08 (.06)	.8	.12** (.04)	ns
Number of formal helping activities	2.0	.75** (.27)	1.9	1.3** (.19)	ns
Average hours per week doing volunteer work or community service in last 6 months	.8	.75 (.44)	.5	3.58** (.29)	**
Attitudes:					
Perceived control (Connell scale)	1.8	.05 (.06)	1.9	-.03 (.04)	ns
Personal and social responsibility (Search Institute scale)					
Social welfare subscale	17.8	1.07 (.63)	18.8	.91* (.44)	ns
Environmental subscale	18.2	1.72* (.70)	19.8	.24 (.49)	ns
Community involvement subscale	18.3	.74 (.60)	18.9	.54 (.42)	ns
Total Score	54.3	3.48* (1.60)	57.6	1.78 (1.13)	ns

[a] T-test and F-test of differences in impacts between subgroups. ns: not statistically significant; * Statistically significant at the 5% level; ** at the 1% level.

Table 2. Economically Disadvantaged High School Students (continued)

Outcome	Economically Disadvantaged		Not Economically Disadvantaged		
	Comparison Group Mean (1)	Impact (standard error) (2)	Comparison Group Mean (3)	Impact (standard error) (4)	Test of Difference in Impacts[a] (5)
Psychosocial maturity (Greenberger scale):					
Communications subscale	2.6	.18* (.09)	2.9	.14* (.06)	ns
Work orientation subscale	2.6	.09 (.09)	2.7	.16* (.07)	ns
Cultural diversity subscale	3.1	.03 (.09)	3.4	-.02 (.06)	ns
School Performance:					
Grade point average	2.0	-.17 (.10)	2.5	.09 (.07)	*
Days absent during program period	14.1	-3.80* (1.49)	6.0	-1.61 (1.03)	ns
Failed 1 or more courses during program period	.4	.04 (.10)	.1	.05 (.08)	ns
At-Risk Behavior:					
Use of drugs or alcohol, fighting, or teen parenting	.6	-.10 (.09)	.5	.04 (.06)	ns

[a] T-test and F-test of differences in impacts between subgroups. ns: not statistically significant; * Statistically significant at the 5% level; ** at the 1% level.

Table 3. Males and Females

Outcome	Male		Female		
	Comparison Group Mean (1)	Impact (standard error) (2)	Comparison Group Mean (3)	Impact (standard error) (4)	Test of Difference in Impacts[a] (5)
Helping Behavior:					
Engaged in any formal helping behavior	.8	.10 (.05)	.8	.10* (.04)	ns
Number of formal helping activities	1.8	1.32** (.24)	2.1	.95** (.20)	ns
Average hours per week doing volunteer work or community service in last 6 months	.6	2.51** (.39)	.7	2.94** (.33)	ns
Attitudes:					
Perceived control (Connell scale)	1.9	-.04 (.05)	1.8	.03 (.04)	ns
Personal and social responsibility (Search Institute scale)					
Social welfare subscale	17.6	.82 (.55)	19.1	1.06* (.46)	ns
Environmental subscale	18.8	.74 (.62)	19.6	.67 (.51)	ns
Community involvement subscale	18.3	.61 (.53)	18.9	.62 (.44)	ns
Total Score	57.6	2.25 (1.41)	57.6	2.31* (1.17)	ns

[a] T-test and F-test of differences in impacts between subgroups. ns: not statistically significant; * Statistically significant at the 5% level; ** at the 1% level.

Table 3. Males and Females (continued)

Outcome	Male		Female		
	Comparison Group Mean (1)	Impact (standard error) (2)	Comparison Group Mean (3)	Impact (standard error) (4)	Test of Difference in Impacts[a] (5)
Psychosocial maturity (Greenberger scale):					
Communications subscale	2.8	.07 (.08)	2.7	.22** (.07)	ns
Work orientation subscale	2.6	.05 (.08)	2.7	.19** (.07)	ns
Cultural diversity subscale	3.2	-.18* (.08)	3.4	.10 (.06)	**
School Performance:					
Grade point average	2.3	-.01 (.09)	2.2	.01 (.08)	ns
Days absent during program period	6.2	-.69 (1.32)	11.6	-3.33** (1.08)	ns
Failed 1 or more courses during program period	.2	.14 (.10)	.3	-.01 (.08)	ns
At-Risk Behavior:					
Use of drugs or alcohol, fighting, or teen parenting	.4	.05 (.08)	.6	-.04 (.06)	ns

[a] T-test and F-test of differences in impacts between subgroups. ns: not statistically significant; * Statistically significant at the 5% level; ** at the 1% level.

Table 4. Ethnic Groups

Outcome	White		Black		Other		Test of Difference in Impacts[a]
	Comparison Group Mean (1)	Impact (standard error) (2)	Comparison Group Mean (3)	Impact (standard error) (4)	Comparison Group Mean (5)	Impact (standard error) (6)	(7)
Helping Behavior:							
Engaged in any formal helping behavior	.8	.10* (.04)	.8	.05 (.07)	.6	.31* (.12)	ns
Number of formal helping activities	1.8	1.35** (.19)	2.3	.23 (.31)	1.3	1.65** (.55)	**
Average hours per week doing volunteer work or community service in last 6 months	.6	3.25** (.30)	.9	1.32* (.52)	.3	2.94** (1.07)	**
Attitudes:							
Perceived control (Connell scale)	1.9	.02 (.04)	1.9	-.03 (.07)	1.9	-.17 (.12)	ns
Personal and social responsibility (Search Institute scale)							
Social welfare subscale	18.7	.83 (.43)	18.2	1.64* (.73)	17.0	-.07 (1.27)	ns
Environmental subscale	20.1	.21 (.48)	17.5	2.03* (.82)	19.0	1.26 (1.41)	ns
Community involvement subscale	18.7	.46 (.41)	18.5	1.08 (.70)	18.6	.68 (1.20)	ns
Total Score	57.5	1.51 (1.10)	54.3	4.63* (1.87)	54.6	2.19 (3.22)	ns

[a] T-test and F-test of differences in impacts between subgroups. ns: not statistically significant; * Statistically significant at the 5% level; ** at the 1% level.

Table 4. Ethnic Groups (continued)

Outcome	White		Black		Other		Test of Difference in Impacts[a]
	Comparison Group Mean (1)	Impact (standard error) (2)	Comparison Group Mean (3)	Impact (standard error) (4)	Comparison Group Mean (5)	Impact (standard error) (6)	(7)
Psychosocial maturity (Greenberger scale):							
Communications subscale	2.8	.13* (.06)	2.6	.15 (.11)	2.6	.45* (.18)	ns
Work orientation subscale	2.7	.16* (.07)	2.6	.05 (.11)	2.5	.23 (.19)	ns
Cultural diversity subscale	3.5	-.07 (.06)	3.1	.07 (.10)	3.1	.41* (.17)	*
School Performance:							
Grade point average	2.5	.04 (.07)	2.1	-.06 (.12)	1.8	-.13 (.20)	ns
Days absent during program period	7.7	-2.04* (1.02)	9.7	-3.53* (1.77)	15.8	-1.08 (2.88)	ns
Failed 1 or more courses during program period	.2	.04 (.08)	.5	-.02 (.12)	.3	.37 (.19)	ns
At-Risk Behavior:							
Use of drugs or alcohol, fighting, or teen parenting	.5	.07 (.06)	.6	-.19 (.10)	.7	-.08 (.18)	ns

[a] T-test and F-test of differences in impacts between subgroups. ns: not statistically significant; * Statistically significant at the 5% level; ** at the 1% level.

Table 5. High School Students Involved in At-Risk Social Behavior

Outcome	Involved in At-Risk Behavior		Not Involved in At-Risk Behavior		Test of Difference in Impacts[a]
	Comparison Group Mean (1)	Impact (standard error) (2)	Comparison Group Mean (3)	Impact (standard error) (4)	(5)
Helping Behavior:					
Engaged in any formal helping behavior	.7	.17** (.05)	.9	.02 (.05)	**
Number of formal helping activities	1.8	1.45** (.21)	2.1	.74* (.22)	*
Average hours per week doing volunteer work or community service in last 6 months	.4	2.91** (.36)	.9	2.62** (.37)	ns
Attitudes:					
Perceived control (Connell scale)	2.0	.01 (.05)	1.8	-.02 (.05)	ns
Personal and social responsibility (Search Institute scale)					
Social welfare subscale	18.5	.64 (.49)	18.3	1.34** (.51)	ns
Environmental subscale	18.9	.65 (.54)	19.6	.71 (.57)	ns
Community involvement subscale	18.5	.57 (.46)	18.8	.72 (.49)	ns
Total Score	56.0	1.89 (1.24)	56.7	2.75* (1.31)	ns

[a] T-test and F-test of differences in impacts between subgroups. ns: not statistically significant; * Statistically significant at the 5% level; ** at the 1% level.

Table 5. High School Students Involved in At-Risk Social Behavior (continued)

Outcome	Involved in At-Risk Behavior: Comparison Group Mean (1)	Involved in At-Risk Behavior: Impact (standard error) (2)	Not Involved in At-Risk Behavior: Comparison Group Mean (3)	Not Involved in At-Risk Behavior: Impact (standard error) (4)	Test of Difference in Impacts[a] (5)
Psychosocial maturity (Greenberger scale):					
Communications subscale	2.8	.20** (.07)	2.7	.11 (.07)	ns
Work orientation subscale	2.6	.22** (.07)	2.7	.06 (.08)	*
Cultural diversity subscale	3.2	-.04 (.07)	3.3	.03 (.07)	ns
School Performance:					
Grade point average	2.2	.07 (.08)	2.3	-.07 (.08)	ns
Days absent during program period	11.2	-2.72* (1.19)	7.3	-1.86 (1.20)	ns
Failed 1 or more courses during program period	.4	-.07 (.09)	.2	.13 (.08)	ns
At-Risk Behavior:					
Use of drugs or alcohol, fighting, or teen parenting	.8	.03 (.07)	.3	-.04 (.07)	ns

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[a] T-test and F-test of differences in impacts between subgroups. ns: not statistically significant; * Statistically significant at the 5% level; ** at the 1% level.

Table 6. High School Students Who Volunteered More Than .8 Hours Per Week in Last 6 Months

Outcome	Volunteered More Than .8 Hours		Volunteered Less Than .8 Hours		
	Comparison Group Mean (1)	Impact (standard error) (2)	Comparison Group Mean (3)	Impact (standard error) (4)	Test of Difference in Impacts[a] (5)
Helping Behavior:					
Engaged in any formal helping behavior	.9	.05 (.07)	.8	.07 (.04)	ns
Number of formal helping activities	2.1	1.25** (.31)	1.9	1.1** (.20)	ns
Average hours per week doing volunteer work or community service in last 6 months	1.6	2.41** (.47)	.4	3.09** (.31)	ns
Attitudes:					
Perceived control (Connell scale)	2.4	.05 (.05)	2.8	-.07 (.06)	ns
Personal and social responsibility (Search Institute scale)					
Social welfare subscale	18.7	1.26 (.68)	19.0	.98* (.45)	ns
Environmental subscale	21.0	.81 (.76)	19.4	.53 (.51)	ns
Community involvement subscale	20.5	.82 (.65)	18.7	.66 (.43)	ns
Total Score	60.2	2.90 (1.73)	57.0	2.20 (1.30)	ns

[a] T-test and F-test of differences in impacts between subgroups. ns: not statistically significant; * Statistically significant at the 5% level; ** at the 1% level.

Table 6. High School Students Who Volunteered More Than .8 Hours Per Week in Last 6 Months (continued)

Outcome	Volunteered More Than .8 Hours: Comparison Group Mean (1)	Volunteered More Than .8 Hours: Impact (standard error) (2)	Volunteered Less Than .8 Hours: Comparison Group Mean (3)	Volunteered Less Than .8 Hours: Impact (standard error) (4)	Test of Difference in Impacts[a] (5)
Psychosocial maturity (Greenberger scale):					
Communications subscale	3.0	.20*	2.8	.14*	ns
		(.10)		(.07)	
Work orientation subscale	2.9	.15	2.7	.14*	ns
		(.10)		(.07)	
Cultural diversity subscale	3.7	.04	3.3	-.04	ns
		(.09)		(.06)	
School Performance:					
Grade point average	2.2	.09	2.4	.06	ns
		(.12)		(.07)	
Days absent during program period	12.1	-1.35	7.3	-2.44*	ns
		(1.79)		(1.04)	
Failed 1 or more courses during program period	.4	.01	.2	.04	ns
		(.13)		(.07)	
At-Risk Behavior:					
Use of drugs or alcohol, fighting, or teen parenting	.4	.04	.5	-.00	ns
		(.10)		(.06)	

[a] T-test and F-test of differences in impacts between subgroups. ns: not statistically significant; * Statistically significant at the 5% level; ** at the 1% level.

Table 7. Program Type: Integrated vs. After-School vs. Course

Outcome	Integrated		After-School		Course		Test of Difference in Impacts[a]
	Comparison Group Mean (1)	Impact (standard error) (2)	Comparison Group Mean (3)	Impact (standard error) (4)	Comparison Group Mean (5)	Impact (standard error) (6)	(7)
Helping Behavior:							
Engaged in any formal helping behavior	.9	.01 (.05)	.7	.15* (.07)	.7	.20** (.06)	*
Number of formal helping activities	2.2	.97** (.22)	2.0	.75* (.34)	1.4	1.55** (.29)	ns
Average hours per week doing volunteer work or community service in last 6 months	.6	3.38** (.32)	.9	.24 (.50)	.5	3.05** (.46)	**
Attitudes:							
Perceived control (Connell scale)	1.8	-.08 (.05)	1.8	.11 (.07)	2.0	.05 (.06)	*
Personal and social responsibility (Search Institute scale)							
Social welfare subscale	19.0	1.83** (.50)	16.8	1.22 (.77)	18.9	-.62 (.65)	*
Environmental subscale	20.5	.82 (.56)	17.6	2.32** (.87)	18.6	-.58 (.73)	*
Community involvement subscale	19.5	1.52** (.48)	18.1	.28 (.74)	17.6	-.62 (.63)	*
Total Score	59.0	4.22** (1.27)	52.5	3.76 (1.98)	55.1	-1.86 (1.67)	*

[a] T-test and F-test of differences in impacts between subgroups. ns: not statistically significant; * Statistically significant at the 5% level; ** at the 1% level.

Table 7. Program Type: Integrated vs. After-School vs. Course (continued)

Outcome	Integrated		After-School		Course		
	Comparison Group Mean (1)	Impact (standard error) (2)	Comparison Group Mean (3)	Impact (standard error) (4)	Comparison Group Mean (5)	Impact (standard error) (6)	Test of Difference in Impacts[a] (7)
Psychosocial maturity (Greenberger scale):							
Communications subscale	2.8	.17* (.07)	2.5	.31** (.11)	2.8	.03 (.10)	ns
Work orientation subscale	2.7	.28** (.08)	2.6	.03 (.11)	2.6	-.01 (.10)	*
Cultural diversity subscale	3.4	.01 (.07)	3.2	.01 (.11)	3.2	-.06 (.09)	ns
School Performance:							
Grade point average	2.6	.09 (.08)	1.7	-.32* (.12)	2.3	.08 (.11)	*
Days absent during program period	5.8	-1.88 (1.15)	18.1	-5.01** (1.76)	4.7	-.80 (1.71)	ns
Failed 1 or more courses during program period	.2	.03 (.07)	.4	.08 (.11)	na	na	na
At-Risk Behavior:							
Use of drugs or alcohol, fighting, or teen parenting	.4	.00 (.07)	.7	-.09 (.11)	.7	.05 (.10)	ns

[a] T-test and F-test of differences in impacts between subgroups. ns: not statistically significant; * Statistically significant at the 5% level; ** at the 1% level.

APPENDIX G

BASELINE AND FOLLOWUP SURVEYS

This appendix contains the baseline and followup interviews administered to the high school sample of program participants. In all, there were four sets of baseline and followup interviews, including a set for middle school participants, one for middle school comparison group members, and one each for high school participants and comparisons. These four sets were identical except as noted below.

The middle school interviews (not included here) were identical to the high school interviews, except that the middle school versions did not contain the questions on risk behaviors (Section H of the high school surveys). For both middle school and high school, the comparison group versions of the baseline interviews (not included here) did not ask the question on reason for program participation (question 4 on the high school participant baseline survey).

The middle school followup interviews (not included here) were identical to the high school interviews except that they did not contain the questions on risk behavior in Section H. The follow-up interviews administered to the comparison groups in both middle school and high school (not included here) were identical to the participant group interviews except that they did not contain the questions in Section B on program experience and satisfaction.

SECTION A

Today's Date: _____/_____/19____ 10-15/
MONTH DAY YEAR

Name: _____
FIRST 16-25/ MIDDLE INITIAL 26/ LAST 27-41/

Student ID: _____ 42-51/

Date of Birth: _____/_____/19____ 52-57/
MONTH DAY YEAR

School Name: _____
58-97/

City: _____ 98-117/ State: _____ 118-119/

Teacher/Coordinator: _____
120-154/

SECTION B

1. How would you describe your racial or ethnic origin? (CHECK ONE)

- ☐1 White (not Hispanic)
- ☐2 Black/African American (Not Hispanic)
- ☐3 Hispanic/Latino
- ☐4 Asian/Pacific Islander
- ☐5 American Indian/Alaskan Native
- ☐6 Other (specify:)_____

155/

2. Your gender?

- ☐1 Male
- ☐2 Female

156/

3. What grade are you in?

_____ 157-158/

4. What was the main reason you signed up for this project? (CHECK ONE)

- ☐1 Everyone in my class is participating 159-160/
- ☐2 Everyone in the school is enrolled 161-168/B
- ☐3 The school requires it
- ☐4 My friends are enrolled
- ☐5 I wanted to help other people
- ☐6 I wanted to learn new things
- ☐7 I wanted to make new friends
- ☐8 My parents wanted me to
- ☐9 Other:_____ 167/

168/

5. Did you work for pay last summer?

☐1 Yes 169/
☐2 No *(GO TO QUESTION 6)*

How many hours per week did you work?

_____ Hours 170-171/

6. Did you work for pay during the last school year?

☐1 Yes 172/
☐2 No *(GO TO QUESTION 7)*

How many hours per week did you work?

_____ Hours 173-174/

7. Do you live with... (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

☐1 Both parents? 175/
☐2 Mother only? 176/
☐3 Father only? 177/
☐4 Other relatives? 178/
☐5 Other guardians? Who? _____ 179/
180/

8. Have you changed schools in the past 12 months?

☐1 Yes 181/
☐2 No *(GO TO QUESTION 9)*

If yes, for what reason? (CHECK ONE)

☐1 Moved 182/
☐2 My grade level not offered at old school
☐3 Some other reason

9. In the past 6 months, have you spent one or more nights in a shelter or some other temporary place because you had no other place to stay?

☐1 Yes 183/
☐2 No

10. Do you speak English at home?

☐1 Yes 184/
☐2 No

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION C

SECTION C1

The statements below are about how some young people feel about their education. For each statement, please indicate whether it is very true for you, sort of true for you, not very true for you, or not at all true for you.

		Very True for You	Sort of True for You	Not Very True for You	Not at All True for You	
a.	I can do well in school if I want to.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	185/
b.	I can't work very hard in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	186/
c.	The best way for me to get good grades is to get my teacher to like me.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	187/
d.	I'm pretty smart in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	188/
e.	I don't know what it takes to get good grades in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	189/
f.	I'm pretty lucky at getting good grades.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	190/
g.	If I don't do well on my schoolwork, it's because I didn't try hard enough.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	191/
h.	I can't get my teachers to like me.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	192/
i.	I can't do well in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	193/
j.	Trying hard is the best way for me to do well in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	194/
k.	I don't know how to keep myself from getting bad grades.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	195/
l.	I won't do well in school if the teachers don't like me.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	196/
m.	I have to be smart to get good grades.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	197/
n.	I am unlucky in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	198/
o.	I can work really hard in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	199/
p.	I have to be lucky to do well in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	200/
q.	If I'm not smart, I won't get good grades.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	201/
r.	If I'm unlucky, I won't do well in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	202/
s.	I can get teachers to like me.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	203/
t.	I'm not very smart in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	204/

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION C2

Below are sentences that have two different endings, one on the left and one on the right. Using the scale below, please circle the number that best shows how you would finish the sentence. For example, in the question below, circling 4 would mean that you "sort of" think that people who get good grades study hard. Circling 1 would mean that you <u>really</u> think that they are just naturally smart.

Sample:

People who get really good grades...

are usually just naturally smart.				usually study hard to get those grades.
1	2	3	4	5

Please circle only <u>one</u> number. Do not mark between the numbers. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers.

1. Taking care of people who are having difficulty caring for themselves...

is everyone's responsibility, including mine.				is not my responsibility.	
1	2	3	4	5	205/

2. When it comes to saving energy...

it's everyone's job to use less.				people worry too much about it.	
1	2	3	4	5	206/

3. Getting actively involved in political or social issues. ..

is not that important to community life.				is an important way to improve the community.	
1	2	3	4	5	207/

4. Cleaning up parks or helping with other environmental projects...

should be done by people who live in the area.				should be done by paid workers.	
1	2	3	4	5	208/

5. Helping others without being paid...

is not something people should feel they have to do.				is something everyone should feel they have to do.	
1	2	3	4	5	209/

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION C3

For each of the following statements, please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree a little, disagree a little, or strongly disagree.

	Strongly Agree	Agree a Little	Dis-agree a Little	Strongly Dis-agree	
1. At school, I try as hard as I can to do my best work.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	220/
2. I like school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	221/
3. My teachers really care about me.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	222/
4. It bothers me when I don't do something well.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	223/
5. It is hard to talk to someone you don't know.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	224/
6. In a discussion, I often find it hard to understand what people are saying.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	225/
7. When a teacher gives direction, I usually understand him or her the first time.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	226/
8. I do not mix well with other people.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	227/
9. It would bother me to work for a person whose race or ethnicity is different from mine.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	228/
10. I would not make friends with a person who had very different manners and clothes from most of my other friends.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	229/
11. It's good for people of different races or ethnic groups to get together at parties and social events.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	230/
12. I would rather not live in a neighborhood where there are people of different races or ethnic groups.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	231/
13. I often don't finish work I start.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	232/
14. I often leave my homework unfinished if there are a lot of good TV shows on that evening.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	233/
15. It's very important to me to do my work well.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	234/
16. Very often I forget work I am supposed to do.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	235/
17. I would not mind working closely on a job with a person whose race is different from mine.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	236/
18. It would probably be better if most old people lived in buildings or neighborhoods with people of their own age.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	237/
19. There is something different about most young people; it's hard to figure out what makes them tick.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	238/

	Strongly Agree	Agree a Little	Dis-agree a Little	Strongly Dis-agree	
20. Men and women can do most jobs equally well.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	239/
21. No one should expect you to do work that you don't like.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	240/
22. I get upset if I am not immediately successful in learning something new.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	241/
23. I seldom get behind in my work.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	242/
24. I often go from one thing to another before finishing any one of them.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	243/
25. If a friend whose ideas about religion are very different from mine gave me a religious article to read, I wouldn't read it.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	244/
26. Allowing people to speak their ideas freely can't really help us find ways to improve our country.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	245/
27. Spanish speaking people who live in the United States will feel happier in the long run if they only speak English.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	246/
28. I don't think I could be close friends with a person with disabilities.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	247/
29. People find it hard to figure me out from what I say.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	248/
30. I am not really accepted and liked.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	249/
31. Hard work is never fun.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	250/
32. I find it hard to stick to anything that takes a long time to do.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	251/
33. I often forget to listen to what others are saying.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	252/
34. It is hard for me to speak my thoughts clearly.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	253/
35. It is not hard to give a talk in front of other people.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	254/
36. I am not good at describing things in writing.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	255/
37. I don't care how I do in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	256/
38. My teachers don't pay much attention to me.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	257/
39. I get a lot of encouragement at my school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	258/

SECTION D

1. In an average week, about how many hours do you spend doing homework?

☐1 0 hours
☐2 1-2 hours
☐3 3-5 hours
☐4 6-10 hours
☐5 11 hours or more

259/

2. Have you ever dropped out of school?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

260/

3. Have you ever repeated a grade?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

261/

4. Overall, how well would you say you get along with your teachers at school?

☐1 Very well
☐2 Pretty well
☐3 Not very well
☐4 Not well at all

262/

SECTION E

1. In the past 6 months have you done any of the following things?

   a. Volunteered for a community organization that does socially useful work or gotten involved in a community service activity?

   ☐1 Yes
   ☐2 No

   263/

   b. Served as a volunteer counselor, mentor, or tutor?

   ☐1 Yes
   ☐2 No

   264/

   c. Written a letter to a newspaper, elected official, or government agency about an issue that you thought was important to the community?

   ☐1 Yes
   ☐2 No

   265/

   d. Gotten involved in a recycling project?

   ☐1 Yes
   ☐2 No

   266/

208

e. Taken part in a community project such as cleaning up a neighborhood park or working in a food bank?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No 267/

f. Visited or helped take care of someone in a nursing home or hospital?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No 268/

2. In the past 6 months have you done any of the following things?

a. Looked after or visited a sick friend or relative?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No 269/

b. Bought or picked up an item for a person who was not able to pick it up him/herself?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No 270/

c. Had a talk with a friend or relative about a personal problem he or she was having?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No 271/

d. Helped to take care of a friend's or neighbor's house or property while they were away or unable to take care of it themselves?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No 272/

e. Spent time teaching a friend or relative a skill that you have, such as playing a musical instrument, speaking another language, or cooking?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No 273/

f. Lent a possession such as a book, record, or car to a friend or relative?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No 274/

g. Looked after the children of a friend or relative without being paid?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No 275/

3. a. Over the last 6 months (26 weeks) in how many weeks did you do some volunteer work?

____ Weeks 276-277/

IF ZERO, GO TO SECTION F.

b. On average, during those weeks that you volunteered, how many hours per week did you volunteer?

____ Average volunteer hours per week 278-279/

SECTION F

Five years from now, how likely is it that you will be involved in the following activities? Please indicate whether it is very likely, somewhat likely, somewhat unlikely, or very unlikely.

		Very Likely	Some-what Likely	Some-what Unlikely	Very Unlikely	
a.	Volunteer for a community organization that does socially useful work or get involved in other community service activities.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	280/
b.	Serve as a volunteer counselor, mentor, or tutor.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	281/
c.	Write a letter to a newspaper, elected official, or government agency about an issue that you think is important to the community.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	282/
d.	Get involved in a recycling project.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	283/
e.	Take part in a community project such as cleaning up a neighborhood park or working in a food bank.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	284/
f.	Visit or help take care of someone in a nursing home or hospital.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	285/
g.	Vote in federal, state, or local elections (when I am old enough).	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	286/

SECTION G

1. During the past 6 months, did you participate in any of the following activities or organizations?

   a. School or non-school sports team

   ☐1 Yes
   ☐2 No

   287/

   b. After school club (such as a math club or school boosters)

   ☐1 Yes
   ☐2 No

   288/

   c. Religious youth group

   ☐1 Yes
   ☐2 No

   289/

   d. Non-school social club

   ☐1 Yes
   ☐2 No

   290/

SECTION H

1. In the past 30 days, have you had anything alcoholic to drink, such as a glass of wine, a beer or a mixed drink?

   ☐1 Yes
   ☐2 No *(GO TO QUESTION 3)*

   291/

   If yes, how many days did you have a drink? (CHECK ONE)

   ☐1 1-2
   ☐2 3-5
   ☐3 6-9
   ☐4 10-19
   ☐5 20-30

   292/

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. In the past 30 days, did you ever drink five or more drinks of wine, beer, or liquor at one time or in one sitting?

☐1 Yes 293/
☐2 No *(GO TO QUESTION 3)*

If yes, how many times? (CHECK ONE)

☐1 Once 294/
☐2 Twice
☐3 3-5 times
☐4 6-9 times
☐5 10 or more times

3. In the past 30 days, have you used any illegal drugs (such as marijuana, cocaine, crack, hallucinogens, or heroin)?

☐1 Yes 295/
☐2 No *(GO TO QUESTION 4)*

If yes, how many times? (CHECK ONE)

☐1 Once 296/
☐2 Twice
☐3 3-5 times
☐4 6-9 times
☐5 10 or more times

4. Have you ever been pregnant, or made someone pregnant?

☐1 Yes 297/
☐2 No *(GO TO QUESTION 6)*

5. Do you have any children of your own?

☐1 Yes 298/
☐2 No *(GO TO QUESTION 6)*

If yes, how many?

_____ 299-300/

6. During the last 6 months, have you ever ...

a. Gotten into a fight where a group of your friends was against another group?

☐1 Yes 301/
☐2 No

b. Hurt someone badly enough to need bandages or a doctor?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

302/

c. Used a knife or a gun or some other thing (like a club) to get something from a person?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

303/

d. Been arrested and charged with a crime?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

304/

SECTION I

1. How important is each of the following to you in your life? Please check whether it is not important at all, not very important, somewhat important, or very important.

		Not Important at All	Not Very Important	Some-what Important	Very Important	
a.	Having lots of money?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	305/
b.	Helping other people?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	306/
c.	Having lots of fun and good times?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	307/
d.	Helping to reduce hunger and poverty in the world?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	308/
e.	Being popular or well-liked?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	309/

2. How far would you <u>like</u> to go in school if you could? (CHECK ONE)

☐1 Drop out of high school before graduation
☐2 Get a GED
☐3 Graduate from high school
☐4 Graduate from a 2-year college
☐5 Graduate from a 4-year college
☐6 Attend graduate school (e.g., Master's, Ph.D.)

310/

3. How far do you <u>expect</u> to go in school? (CHECK ONE)

☐1 Drop out of high school before graduation
☐2 Get a GED
☐3 Graduate from high school
☐4 Graduate from a 2-year college
☐5 Graduate from a 4-year college
☐6 Attend graduate school (e.g., Master's, Ph.D.)

311/

4. If you could choose the job you would like to have when you are out of school, what would it be?

_____ 312-313/

5. What job do you expect to have after you have finished school?

_____ 314-315

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Program Name: _____ 316-355/

Program Code: _____ 356-360/

Type: ☐1 P
☐2 C 361/

Office Use Only:

1-9/

OMB 3200-0016
Expires: September 1995

Abt Associates, Inc.
Brandeis University

NATIONAL COMMUNITY SERVICE STUDY
Follow-Up Student Survey

Dear Student:

This survey is part of a national study of community service programs. As you may know, these are programs that encourage school-age youth to take part in volunteer activities in the community. Over 1,000 schools and community organizations across the country run community service programs.

This survey is the second in a series of surveys focusing on the characteristics, attitudes, and activities of young people who are involved in community service programs. It is also being given to young people who are not in community service programs so that we can learn about them as well. You completed a similar survey earlier in the year. The questionnaire is being given to approximately 100 young people in your community and to over 1,000 young people in other communities around the country.

As you complete this questionnaire, there are three important points we want you to keep in mind:

*First, this survey is **confidential**. No one at your school or in your community will ever know how you answered any of the questions. When you are done, you will put your questionnaire into an envelope and seal it, and it will be sent directly to the researchers at Abt Associates and Brandeis University in Boston, Massachusetts. The Abt/Brandeis researchers are the **only** people who will ever see the completed surveys.*

*Second, this survey is **voluntary**. If there are any questions that you do not want to answer, you may leave them blank.*

*Third, **this is not a test**. Please try to answer the questions in this survey as accurately and honestly as possible. **There are no "right" or "wrong" answers.** Just try to give the answer that best reflects how you think or feel.*

Thank you for your help with this important study.

SECTION A

Today's Date: _____/_____/19____ 10-15/
MONTH DAY YEAR

PLEASE COMPLETE ALL OF THE NEXT SIX ITEMS. REMEMBER, YOUR ANSWERS WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL. NO ONE AT YOUR SCHOOL WILL KNOW HOW YOU ANSWERED THESE QUESTIONS.

Name: _____
FIRST 16-25/ MIDDLE INITIAL 26/ LAST 27-41/

Student ID: _____ 42-51/

Date of Birth: _____/_____/19____ 52-57/
MONTH DAY YEAR

School Name: _____
58-97/

City: _____ State: _____
98-117/ 118-119/

Teacher/Coordinator: _____
120-154/

SECTION B

The following questions are about the community service activity you participated in as part of the Serve-America program at your school.

1. Overall, how satisfied were you with your community service experience? 155/

- ☐1 Very satisfied,
- ☐2 Somewhat satisfied,
- ☐3 Somewhat dissatisfied, or
- ☐4 Very dissatisfied?

2. Did you feel that the service you performed was... 156/

- ☐1 Very helpful to the community,
- ☐2 Somewhat helpful to the community,
- ☐3 Not very helpful to the community, or
- ☐4 Not helpful at all?

3. Did you feel that the service you performed was... 157/

- ☐1 Very helpful to the individuals you served,
- ☐2 Somewhat helpful to the individuals you served,
- ☐3 Not very helpful to the individuals you served, or
- ☐4 Not helpful at all?

4. Did you learn a particular skill that will be useful to you in the future?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

158/

5. Do you feel that all students should be encouraged to participate in community service?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

159/

6. Should all students be required to participate in community service?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

160/

7. How many hours in total did you spend on your community service project?

_____ hours

161-163/

8. Did you work as part of a team (group, crew, etc.) or on an individual assignment?

☐1 Team
☐2 Individual

164/

9. Please indicate the type of community service activities that you were involved in. (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

☐1 Education (tutoring, etc.) 165/
☐2 Community improvement 166/
☐3 Human services (visiting nursing homes, etc.) 167/
☐4 Conservation 168/
☐5 Disaster response 169/
☐6 Public safety 170/
☐7 Other 171/

10. Did you design or select your specific community service project or activity, or were you assigned an activity by someone else?

☐1 Designed it myself
☐2 Was assigned

172/

11. Did your community service experience include time set aside in class when you talked about your service experience?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

173/

12. Did you keep a journal or diary as part of your community service project?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

174/

13. Did you develop a really good personal relationship with someone during your community service experience?

☐1 Yes 175/
☐2 No *(GO TO QUESTION 14)*

If yes, was that person... (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

☐1 My supervisor at the community service site 176/
☐2 Another adult working at the site 177/
☐3 A teacher 178/
☐4 Another student working at the same site 179/
☐5 A person I was helping 180/
☐6 Other (Who?: _____) 181/

14. When you compare your community service experience to a typical class that you've taken in school, did you learn...

☐1 Much more, 182/
☐2 More,
☐3 About the same,
☐4 Less, or
☐5 Much less than in a typical class?

15. The following list describes some features of a community service experience. Please describe <u>your</u> community service experience by answering whether it was practically never, once in a great while, sometimes, fairly often, or very often.

	Practically Never	Once in a Great While	Some-times	Fairly Often	Very Often	
a. Had real responsibilities	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	183/
b. Had challenging tasks	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	184/
c. Made important decisions	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	185/
d. Discussed my experiences with teachers	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	186/
e. Did things myself instead of observing	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	187/
f. Had freedom to develop and use my own ideas	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	188/
g. Discussed my experiences with my family and friends	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	189/
h. Adults at the site took a personal interest in me	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	190/
i. Had freedom to explore my own interests	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	191/
j. Had a variety of tasks to do at the site	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	192/

	Practically Never	Once in a Great While	Some-times	Fairly Often	Very Often	
k. Needed more help from my supervisor	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	193/
l. Adults criticized me or my work	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	194/
m. Felt I made a contribution	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5	195/

SECTION C

SECTION C1

The statements below are about how some young people feel about their education. For each statement, please indicate whether it is very true for you, sort of true for you, not very true for you, or not at all true for you.

		Very True for You	Sort of True for You	Not Very True for You	Not at All True for You	
a.	I can do well in school if I want to.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	196/
b.	I can't work very hard in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	197/
c.	The best way for me to get good grades is to get my teacher to like me.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	198/
d.	I'm pretty smart in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	199/
e.	I don't know what it takes to get good grades in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	200/
f.	I'm pretty lucky at getting good grades.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	201/
g.	If I don't do well on my schoolwork, it's because I didn't try hard enough.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	202/
h.	I can't get my teachers to like me.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	203/
i.	I can't do well in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	204/
j.	Trying hard is the best way for me to do well in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	205/
k.	I don't know how to keep myself from getting bad grades.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	206/
l.	I won't do well in school if the teachers don't like me.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	207/
m.	I have to be smart to get good grades.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	208/
n.	I am unlucky in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	209/
o.	I can work really hard in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	210/
p.	I have to be lucky to do well in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	211/
q.	If I'm not smart, I won't get good grades.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	212/
r.	If I'm unlucky, I won't do well in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	213/
s.	I can get teachers to like me.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	214/
t.	I'm not very smart in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	215/

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION C2

Below are sentences that have two different endings, one on the left and one on the right. Using the scale below, please circle the number that best shows how you would finish the sentence. For example, in the question below, circling 4 would mean that you "sort of" think that people who get good grades study hard. Circling 1 would mean that you <u>really</u> think that they are just naturally smart.

Sample:

People who get really good grades...

are usually just naturally smart.				usually study hard to get those grades.
1	2	3	4	5

Please circle only <u>one</u> number. Do not mark between the numbers. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers.

1. Taking care of people who are having difficulty caring for themselves...

is everyone's responsibility, including mine.				is not my responsibility.
1	2	3	4	5

216/

2. When it comes to saving energy...

it's everyone's job to use less.				people worry too much about it.
1	2	3	4	5

217/

3. Getting actively involved in political or social issues. ..

is not that important to community life.				is an important way to improve the community.
1	2	3	4	5

218/

4. Cleaning up parks or helping with other environmental projects...

should be done by people who live in the area.				should be done by paid workers.
1	2	3	4	5

219/

5. Helping others without being paid...

is not something people should feel they have to do.				is something everyone should feel they have to do.
1	2	3	4	5

220/

6. Being concerned about state and local issues is...

an important responsibility for everybody. — not something in which most people should be involved.

1 2 3 4 5

221/

7. Keeping the environment safe and clean...

is something I <u>don't</u> feel personally responsible for. — is something I feel personally responsible for.

1 2 3 4 5

222/

8. Helping a person in need...

is something people should do only for friends or relatives. — is something people should do for anyone, even if they don't know them.

1 2 3 4 5

223/

9. Doing something about school problems...

is a job for only a few people who want to be involved. — is something every person should be involved in.

1 2 3 4 5

224/

10. Helping other people...

is something I feel a strong need to do. — is something I prefer to let others do.

1 2 3 4 5

225/

11. Being actively involved in community issues...

is something I feel personally responsible for. — is something I <u>don't</u> feel personally responsible for.

1 2 3 4 5

226/

12. The problems of pollution and toxic waste...

are not something for which individuals are responsible. — are everyone's responsibility to stop.

1 2 3 4 5

227/

13. Helping other people...

is something I feel personally responsible for. — is something I <u>don't</u> feel personally responsible for.

1 2 3 4 5

228/

14. Recycling cans, bottles, and other things...

is too much hassle for me to bother with. — is everyone's job including mine.

1 2 3 4 5 229

15. Working to improve the community...

is an important job for everyone, even beginners. — is only the job of people who know how to do it.

1 2 3 4 5 230

SECTION C3

For each of the following statements, please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree a little, disagree a little, or strongly disagree.

	Strongly Agree	Agree a Little	Dis-agree a Little	Strongly Dis-agree	
1. At school, I try as hard as I can to do my best work.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	231
2. I like school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	232
3. My teachers really care about me.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	233
4. It bothers me when I don't do something well.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	234
5. It is hard to talk to someone you don't know.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	235
6. In a discussion, I often find it hard to understand what people are saying.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	236
7. When a teacher gives direction, I usually understand him or her the first time.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	237
8. I do not mix well with other people.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	238
9. It would bother me to work for a person whose race or ethnicity is different from mine.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	239
10. I would not make friends with a person who had very different manners and clothes from most of my other friends.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	240
11. It's good for people of different races or ethnic groups to get together at parties and social events.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	241
12. I would rather not live in a neighborhood where there are people of different races or ethnic groups.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	242
13. I often don't finish work I start.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	243

		Strongly Agree	Agree a Little	Dis-agree a Little	Strongly Dis-agree	
14.	I often leave my homework unfinished if there are a lot of good TV shows on that evening.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	244/
15.	It's very important to me to do my work well.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	245/
16.	Very often I forget work I am supposed to do.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	246/
17.	I would not mind working closely on a job with a person whose race is different from mine.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	247/
18.	It would probably be better if most old people lived in buildings or neighborhoods with people of their own age.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	248/
19.	There is something different about most young people; it's hard to figure out what makes them tick.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	249/
20.	Men and women can do most jobs equally well.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	250/
21.	No one should expect you to do work that you don't like.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	251/
22.	I get upset if I am not immediately successful in learning something new.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	252/
23.	I seldom get behind in my work.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	253/
24.	I often go from one thing to another before finishing any one of them.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	254/
25.	If a friend whose ideas about religion are very different from mine gave me a religious article to read, I wouldn't read it.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	255/
26.	Allowing people to speak their ideas freely can't really help us find ways to improve our country.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	256/
27.	Spanish speaking people who live in the United States will feel happier in the long run if they only speak English.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	257/
28.	I don't think I could be close friends with a person with disabilities.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	258/
29.	People find it hard to figure me out from what I say.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	259/
30.	I am not really accepted and liked.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	260/
31.	Hard work is never fun.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	261/
32.	I find it hard to stick to anything that takes a long time to do.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	262/

	Strongly Agree	Agree a Little	Dis-agree a Little	Strongly Dis-agree	
33. I often forget to listen to what others are saying.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	263/
34. It is hard for me to speak my thoughts clearly.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	264/
35. It is not hard to give a talk in front of other people.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	265/
36. I am not good at describing things in writing.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	266/
37. I don't care how I do in school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	267/
38. My teachers don't pay much attention to me.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	268/
39. I get a lot of encouragement at my school.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	269/

SECTION D

1. In an average week, about how many hours do you spend doing homework?

☐1 0 hours
☐2 1-2 hours
☐3 3-5 hours
☐4 6-10 hours
☐5 11 hours or more

270/

2. Overall, how well would you say you get along with your teachers at school?

☐1 Very well
☐2 Pretty well
☐3 Not very well
☐4 Not well at all

271/

SECTION E

1. In the past 6 months have you done any of the following things?

a. Volunteered for a community organization that does socially useful work or gotten involved in a community service activity?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

272/

b. Served as a volunteer counselor, mentor, or tutor?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

273/

c. Written a letter to a newspaper, elected official, or government agency about an issue that you thought was important to the community?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

274/

d. Gotten involved in a recycling project?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

275/

e. Taken part in a community project such as cleaning up a neighborhood park or working in a food bank?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

276/

f. Visited or helped take care of someone in a nursing home or hospital?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

277/

2. In the past 6 months have you done any of the following things?

a. Looked after or visited a sick friend or relative?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

278/

b. Bought or picked up an item for a person who was not able to pick it up him/herself?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

279/

c. Had a talk with a friend or relative about a personal problem he or she was having?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

280/

d. Helped to take care of a friend's or neighbor's house or property while they were away or unable to take care of it themselves?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

281/

e. Spent time teaching a friend or relative a skill that you have, such as playing a musical instrument, speaking another language, or cooking?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

282/

f. Lent a possession such as a book, record, or car to a friend or relative?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

283/

g. Looked after the children of a friend or relative with out being paid?

☐1 Yes
☐2 No

284/

3. a. Over the last 6 months (26 weeks) in how many weeks did you do some volunteer work or community service?

____ Weeks
IF ZERO, SKIP TO SECTION F.

285-286/

3b. On average, in those weeks when you volunteered, how many hours per week did you volunteer?

____ Average volunteer hours per week

287-288/

SECTION F

Five years from now, how likely is it that you will be involved in the following activities? Please indicate whether it is very likely, somewhat likely, somewhat unlikely, or very unlikely.

		Very Likely	Some-what Likely	Some-what Unlikely	Very Unlikely	
a.	Volunteer for a community organization that does socially useful work or get involved in other community service activities.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	289/
b.	Serve as a volunteer counselor, mentor, or tutor.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	290/
c.	Write a letter to a newspaper, elected official, or government agency about an issue that you think is important to the community.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	291/
d.	Get involved in a recycling project.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	292/
e.	Take part in a community project such as cleaning up a neighborhood park or working in a food bank.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	293/
f.	Visit or help take care of someone in a nursing home or hospital.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	294/
g.	Vote in federal, state, or local elections (when I am old enough).	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	295/

SECTION G

1. During the past 6 months, did you participate in any of the following activities or organizations?

   a. School or non-school sports team

   ☐1 Yes
   ☐2 No

   296/

   b. After school club (such as a math club or school boosters)

   ☐1 Yes
   ☐2 No

   297/

   c. Religious youth group

   ☐1 Yes
   ☐2 No

   298/

   d. Non-school social club

   ☐1 Yes
   ☐2 No

   299/

SECTION H

1. In the past 30 days, have you had anything alcoholic to drink, such as a glass of wine, a beer or a mixed drink?

   ☐1 Yes
   ☐2 No ***(GO TO QUESTION 3)***

   300/

   If yes, how many days did you have a drink? (CHECK ONE)

   ☐1 1-2
   ☐2 3-5
   ☐3 6-9
   ☐4 10-19
   ☐5 20-30

   301/

2. In the past 30 days, did you ever drink five or more drinks of wine, beer, or liquor at one time or in one sitting?

   ☐1 Yes
   ☐2 No ***(GO TO QUESTION 3)***

   302/

   If yes, how many times? (CHECK ONE)

   ☐1 Once
   ☐2 Twice
   ☐3 3-5 times
   ☐4 6-9 times
   ☐5 10 or more times

   303/

3. In the past 30 days, have you used any illegal drugs (such as marijuana, cocaine, crack, hallucinogens, or heroin)?

☐1 Yes 304/
☐2 No *(GO TO QUESTION 4)*

If yes, how many times? (CHECK ONE)

☐1 Once 305/
☐2 Twice
☐3 3-5 times
☐4 6-9 times
☐5 10 or more times

4. Have you ever been pregnant, or made someone pregnant?

☐1 Yes 306/
☐2 No *(GO TO QUESTION 6)*

5. Do you have any children of your own?

☐1 Yes 307/
☐2 No *(GO TO QUESTION 6)*

If yes, how many?

_____ 308-309/

6. During the last 6 months, have you ever ...

a. Gotten into a fight where a group of your friends was against another group?

☐1 Yes 310/
☐2 No

b. Hurt someone badly enough to need bandages or a doctor?

☐1 Yes 311/
☐2 No

c. Used a knife or a gun or some other thing (like a club) to get something from a person?

☐1 Yes 312/
☐2 No

7. a. Have you ever been arrested and charged with a crime?

☐1 Yes 313/
☐2 No *(GO TO SECTION I)*

b. If yes, when was your most recent arrest?

_____ / 19_____ 314-317/
Month Year 318-325/B

c. Were you convicted of any of these charges?

☐1 Yes 326/
☐2 No

SECTION I

1. How important is each of the following to you in your life? Please check whether it is not important at all, not very important, somewhat important, or very important.

		Not Important at All	Not Very Important	Some-what Important	Very Important	
a.	Having lots of money?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	327/
b.	Helping other people?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	328/
c.	Having lots of fun and good times?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	329/
d.	Helping to reduce hunger and poverty in the world?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	330/
e.	Being popular or well-liked?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	331/

2. How far would you **like** to go in school if you could? (CHECK ONE)

☐1 Drop out of high school before graduation 332/
☐2 Get a GED
☐3 Graduate from high school
☐4 Graduate from a 2-year college
☐5 Graduate from a 4-year college
☐6 Attend graduate school (Master's or Ph.D.)

3. How far do you **expect** to go in school? (CHECK ONE)

☐1 Drop out of high school before graduation 333/
☐2 Get a GED
☐3 Graduate from high school
☐4 Graduate from a 2-year college
☐5 Graduate from a 4-year college
☐6 Attend graduate school (Master's or Ph.D.)

4. If you could choose the job you would **like** to have when you are out of school, what would it be?

_____ 334-336/

5. What job do you **expect** to have after you have finished school?

_____ 337-339/

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

We appreciate the time you have taken to complete this questionnaire. We want to remind you that all of your answers will be kept confidential. No one in your school or program will see any of the information in this questionnaire. When you have finished, please put the questionnaire in the envelope and seal it.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Program Name: _____ 340-379/

Program Code: _____ 380-384/

Type: P 385/1

APPENDIX H

REPRESENTATIVE PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Human Needs

Two volunteers ran a booth for face painting for children at a neighborhood center's annual block party.

Four to ten of the young women in the program worked as aides in a child care program with 50 children once a month.

Four volunteers helped to prepare and serve several evening meals to more than 150 adults and children in a soup kitchen.

Thirteen volunteers worked once a month in a residential home for children with severe developmental disabilities. They led craft projects, wrapped gifts, and helped the residents participate in a local version of the Special Olympics.

Eight students organized floor parties and assisted with patient transport for x-rays and treatment at two city hospitals.

Eight students worked as day care aides for seventeen children whose parents are transitioning into the workforce. The students each worked one three-hour shift a week, providing assistance coverage for most of the center's operating hours.

Two students produced multimedia life histories of residents in an elder care center. The students interviewed the residents extensively and also used residents' family photographs to describe their lives. Two others spent five to six hours weekly in a similar facility as visiting companions for adults with dementia.

Two volunteers managed various aspects of a nonprofit theater arts center for five hours a week. They sold tickets at events, answered phones and took ticket reservations, and even painted sets.

One student worked two afternoons a week planning care schedules and assisting with consulting room setups and cleanups before and after patient visits in a city health clinic.

Two volunteers spent the semester serving meals and stocking supplies in an adult day care program twice a week. They also planned and supervised art projects for residents.

Two students worked at the city's Department of Human Services coordinating public transportation for disabled elderly residents. They also managed the city's food distribution program for disadvantaged families.

Three volunteers provided direct, one-on-one support for recreational activities including swimming and some outdoor sports for children with moderate to severe mental limitations. The volunteers worked at the development center a minimum of six hours weekly.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Human Needs *(continued)*

Two students assisted children with physical disabilities in their participation in noncompetitive games in a sports/outdoor program for five hours a week throughout the spring.

Two volunteers worked six hours a week throughout the school year to provide technical and data entry support for the upgrade of information systems at the county library.

Two teens provided assistance two hours an afternoon, five days a week, throughout the academic year, for thirty children in an afterschool care program. The volunteers supervised art projects for children in the primary grades, and provided one-on-one tutorials for older students.

Four volunteers spent four hours a week providing visiting and delivery services for elderly patients in the acute care wing of a local hospital. They delivered meals, flowers, and mail, and assisted with discharges. Two other students performed similar duties with twelve adults in a permanent care facility. Two worked one afternoon weekly in another acute care program for the elderly as clerical support staff.

Two volunteers worked one afternoon a week as assistants for a troop of Daisy Girl Scouts (that is, five year olds who are not quite old enough to be Brownies.) The assistants provided project supervision and oversaw snack time.

Three students spent six hours a week working as "evening care" aides for between four and ten preschoolers while their parents attended GED classes.

Eight middle schoolers spent a day answering phone calls from constituents to a national congressman's office.

Three volunteers spent two days as play pals for children in a day care center.

Twenty students spent two days bagging surplus food at each of two different sites for distribution to poor families living in the region.

Ten middle schoolers spent two afternoons socializing with elders in an assisted living facility.

Twenty five middle schoolers spent two days at a preschool for children with multiple disabilities. The two groups worked together to put on a talent show for families.

During the spring semester, the entire middle school ran a drive to collect personal hygiene items for a shelter program for homeless people in Denver. The students collected more than 3000 items.

Ten students worked two afternoons sorting donated clothes for distribution to poor and transient families.

Seventeen middle school volunteers spent an hour a day as "companions" for elderly residents in advanced care facilities.

Thirty students spent at least one hour a day for nine weeks helping to promote a concert to benefit a theater restoration project. They made and distributed posters, made their own public service

Human Needs *(continued)*

announcements for local television and radio programs, worked as stage hands, and ran a concession stand at the event itself.

Education

Ten volunteers tutored elementary school students individually for an hour at a time, six hours a week. They also served as project support "aides" for teachers at local elementary schools for larger classroom projects.

Two volunteers worked four nights a week as tutors for adults needing intensive tutorial support in English as a Second Language. In addition, the volunteers organized career preparation seminars, concerts, and a lecture series throughout the year for the city's Adult Basic Education program.

Three tutors worked with middle school students with special education needs. The volunteers worked with the students one-on-one, a half hour at a time for three hours a day, twice a week.

One volunteer's sole commitment was to manage all public affairs for the SITES Program. He coordinated transportation and administrative contacts with field agencies, represented the program to the media, and served on SITES' Voluntary Advisory Council for the entire year.

Another spent a semester with the Public Affairs staff in the Office of the Mayor. Her responsibilities included management of the Christmas lighting and Arbor Day programs for the downtown area.

One volunteer read aloud to fourteen kindergarten students five times weekly. She also helped with arts projects in the classroom.

Two students staffed the public information desk and performed clerical duties twice a week at a NASA science education center.

Two students worked for two weeks as coordinators for a field day program for sixty preschoolers. The students designed most of the athletic events supervised many of them on the day of the event. They also assisted with the distribution of refreshments and awards.

Twenty to twenty-five middle school students worked two hours a week making posters about drug and alcohol safety awareness, and later mounted the posters in the school system and throughout the community.

Nearly ninety middle schoolers worked at community events through the year to promote volunteerism, distributing flyers and speaking about the program.

Nearly fifty middle school volunteers served as "penpals" for preschoolers whose parents attended day and evening classes. They also served as "big siblings" for these children in an intergenerational choir, and assisted with the creation of a mural in the preschool classroom.

Public Safety

One student worked as a administrative assistant to the Chief of the city's fire department for ten hours a week. His responsibilities included fielding phone inquiries, data management, and correspondence.

Two students worked ten hours a week as archivists for court documents in the city's police department. They also answered a good portion of the 27,000 calls that came into the office last year.

Twenty eighth graders spent a semester learning CPR and related emergency medical treatments as part of their science curriculum. One student later saved her mother's life with the Heimlich maneuver which she had learned in the CPR class.

Environment

Fifteen students spent two afternoons grooming horses and cleaning corrals at a rescue program for abandoned and aging animals.

145 students spent six hours a week "rehabilitating" the grounds of their school. They built a neighborhood park around the facility, re-landscaped the school grounds, and built garden beds for community use. They also published a community newsletter informing the community about their revitalization efforts.

49 high school students spent an average of 20 hours each building and landscaping a community park, which included walking paths, a children's play area, and baseball fields.

Two students spent eight hours a week assisting a nature preserve/field ecology education center. They provided hands on animal care, and made presentations to groups of up to 75 visitors about preservation and biology.

One student served as a liaison and support staff for recreational activities for the city's park and recreation center.

Two students assisted two afternoons a week with the grounds and facilities maintenance of an agency which provides services to deaf people.

Several students helped with the organizing of the town's annual spring fair. They procured donations of supplies from local businesses. On the day of the event, they ran two food stands, painted backdrops and assembled a concert stage.

Two students spent two full days working with moving and cleaning crews to help set up a medical clinic.

Ten young women from a Senior Girl Scout troop supervised children engaged in arts projects at citywide parks events on Easter, Halloween, and Christmas. Activities included pumpkin and basket decorating, and card making. The volunteers also supervised a massive Easter egg hunt.